DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 803 EA 012 368

AUTHOR McHugh, Royston, Ed.
TITLE Educational Administration: Approaches to Professional Development. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society (7th, London, England, September 1978).
INSTITUTION British Educational Administration Society.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 113p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; *Educational Administration; Foreign Countries; *Professional Development; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS *British Educational Administration Society; *England

ABSTRACT

This book contains proceedings of the annual conference of the British Educational Administration Society (BEAS) held in September 1978 in London. The theme of the conference was approaches to the professional development of educational administrators and the future role of the BEAS in that process. Three speeches are included, covering the following topics: the future of BEAS, requirements for professional development, and future developments in the field of educational administration. A panel discussion of the proceedings is also included. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED182803

Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society.

Educational Administration: Approaches to Professional Development

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D L. Parkes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 012 364

Edited for the Society by Royston McHugh

2

Autumn 1979

Educational Administration:
Approaches to Professional Development

The Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society, arranged by the South East Branch at Westfield College, London, September 1978.

Edited for the Society by

Royston McHugh
Senior Research Fellow
The Open University

Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference of the
British Educational Administration Society

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: APPROACHES TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Contents

INTRODUCTION 1
Royston McHugh,
Senior Research Fellow, The Open University.

THE BRITISH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SOCIETY: THE NEXT SEVEN YEARS 1
George Baron,
Emeritus Professor of Educational Administration,
University of London.

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - WILL IT WORK? 12
William Bree,
Deputy Director General,
British Institute of Management.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS 19
Ron Glatter,
Professor of Educational Administration and Management,
The Open University.

REPORTS OF PROCEEDINGS
Notes from Discussion in the Plenary Sessions 43
Summary of the Open Forum 56
A Review of Conference Data Sheets and Group Reports 66
Royston McHugh

APPENDICES
List of Conference Participants 81
Conference Programme 88
Conference Discussion Guides and Data Sheets 96

INTRODUCTION

Royston McHugh

The Theme of the Seventh Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society (BEAS) was 'Educational Administration: Approaches to Professional Development'. The choice of this theme and title was decided after the Organising Committee had identified two major objectives for the Conference.

Firstly, the Conference had to provide an issue for debate which was of direct professional relevance and of major importance to ALL members of the Society, no matter which sector of the education service they came from.

Secondly, the Conference had to provide opportunities for members to discuss the whole question of the future development of the Society.

Happily for the Committee the whole question of professional development was just beginning to emerge as an important issue for educational administrators, not only in the United Kingdom but in many other countries of the world. It satisfied the first major objective for the Conference and the Committee thought that the large and varied type of BEAS membership would ensure that the many different approaches to the problem would be brought to bear during the Conference.

In choosing this theme the Committee felt they would also achieve their second major objective. One of the main aims of the Society is the professional development of its members and thus consideration of this basic issue would lead quite naturally to a debate on the future development of BEAS.

Bearing in mind the two major objectives the Committee felt it was important to structure the Conference in such a way as to

achieve maximum participation and to provide opportunities for ALL participants to contribute to the debate. This explains why the Conference Programme contained a more detailed set of objectives than was usual, notes of guidance for Group Chairman were produced and why all participants were asked to complete the Conference Data Sheets, these were designed to help promote effective discussion and to facilitate the compilation of the Group Reports. Copies of these documents referred to are included as appendices to the Proceedings. No pre-Conference papers were circulated and the three main speakers were asked to make statements of their personal views of the Conference theme. One more distinctive feature of the Conference was the decision to invite a number of 'participant observers' and fellow members of the European Forum on Educational Administration to attend the Conference in order to ensure the benefits of 'outsider' contributions to the debate.

The Conference itself ran smoothly and according to plan. Members had ample opportunity for discussing the major questions listed in the Conference Programme and many other issues raised by the three main speakers. At times the discussion was diffuse and somewhat repetitive, however, this was not surprising because participants kept returning to what eventually became the critical issue of the Conference, Whither BEAS? This was pleasing to the organisers because it fulfilled the second major objective for the Conference which was to provide a 'self examination' of the Society in terms of its future role.

Comments from many participants confirm the view that the Conference provided this valuable service of turning the attention of the membership to the fundamental issues concerned with the future development of the Society.

There was also evidence to show that the Conference initiated lively discussions on the question of professional development and there is no doubt that these are just the beginnings of what promises to become an issue of major debate.

In some respects the agreed findings of the Conference are limited because on many of the more detailed issues of provision there is still a diversity of views and opinions within the Society. This also applies to the major question of the future role of the Society, as discussed in the final section of these Proceedings.

Certainly the Conference showed members that great gaps exist in our individual and collective knowledge about many aspects of the present provision for professional development in educational administration. It is gratifying to note that one of the major recommendations of the Conference, that relating to this lack of information, is soon to be fulfilled. Recently it was announced that the Department of Education and Science has awarded a research grant to Professor Meredydd Hughes, Chairman of BEAS, to carry out a survey and evaluation of the present provision of courses in educational administration and management.

As in previous years much of the success of the Conference was due to the hard work of certain individuals. Responsibility for organising the Conference was taken by the South East Branch Committee and thanks are particularly due to Alan Crispin who negotiated all the arrangements at Westfield College, and Pamela Young who undertook the difficult task of co-ordinating the applications and coping with the financial arrangements in collaboration with Alan Crispin. As Conference Secretary Joan Bull was her usual efficient self and did much to ensure the smooth running of the Conference. Thanks are also due to Margaret Rockall who provided secretarial support to the Editor and helped in the preparation of the Conference papers.

Excellent contributions were made by the Conference Chairmen, particularly the twelve Discussion Group Chairmen who produced good reports which were very much in accordance with the notes given. Acknowledgement of their work is included at the end of the section in which the reports are analysed.

A final word of thanks is due to all participants for completing

the Conference Data Sheets, this has made the work of the Editor that much easier. The Society is also indebted to the British Council for the award of a grant which enabled us to provide hospitality for a number of members of the European Forum on Educational Administration who attended the Conference.

THE BRITISH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SOCIETY: THE NEXT SEVEN YEARS

George Baron,
Emeritus Professor of Educational Administration,
University of London.

It is now very nearly exactly seven years since this Society achieved hazardous birth on 16th October, 1971. What now needs to be done and what will the Society look like in another seven years?

First, I should like to consider what we have achieved, as measured against the aims incorporated in our constitution.

Second, I want to open up debate on the present position of educational administration in this country as a field of study, training and research which contributes to effective practice.

Third, I want to suggest some lines of thought which might help in determining our objectives and our programmes until at least the mid-eighties.

As for our achievements, I suggest we have succeeded:

> In bringing together those concerned with the practice, study and research in educational administration throughout the United Kingdom as a whole.

A glance at the list of those attending this conference justifies this statement. We include education officers, heads, principals, lecturers, teachers and we come from all four corners of the kingdom. We do not include all those who occupy the most visible top positions: but we do include all those who are leaders in the new approach to the administration of education which we represent and who will most certainly be leaders in the wider

context in the years ahead. In another seven years there will be a substantial and important minority of education officers, heads of schools and college principals who subscribe to our aims.

It is for this reason that the theme of this conference - to which this address is but a prologue - professional development - is of such major significance.

I suggest also that we have succeeded:

> in developing and maintaining contact with international organisations and in international activities

In this area we have, I submit, been outstandingly successful. The Society has been a mainstay of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, we ran our own International Intervisitation Programme in 1974, we have assisted in the setting up of similar societies as our own in Nigeria, Cyprus, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Singapore and we are now engaged in the exciting new venture of the European Forum.

Such beginnings have necessarily directly affected only a limited - though nevertheless appreciable - number of members as yet, but the scene is now changing: the major international events have (apart from IIP 1974), because of the Australian initiative, taken place east of Suez, but the plan is to hold the next International Intervisitation Programme in Nigeria in 1982 and before that a Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration in Cyprus in 1979. The possibilities of wide membership involvement in the affairs of the European Forum are obviously very great indeed.

I suggest also that we have succeeded:

> in disseminating knowledge about research training and practice

It has been a major achievement to launch a first journal of educational administration in this country and to publish a series of public conference proceedings. It should also be noted that a first seminar on research in educational administration, supported by a grant from the Social Science Research Council, is being held in Birmingham next year.

At this point and before I go on to outline the tasks which lie ahead, I want to consider what is the essential nature of the Society. I think we need to make it very clear to the outside world (as it is already clear to us here) that we are not in any sense a professional association as are, for example, the Society of Education Officers or the Secondary Heads Association in England and Wales or the Educational Institute of Scotland. Nor are we a pressure group, to be associated with campaigns for or against corporate management, the evaluation of teacher performance, another reorganisation of local government or the central control of the curriculum. Our task is to act as a 'forum' for educational administration generally. We are particularly fitted to act in this way by reason of our range of interests, the high level already achieved in our discussions and publications, and because only in this Society is to be found a varied mix of teachers, practitioners, researchers, advisers and administrators. Our task is one which cannot be performed by any other body, whether the Department of Education and Science, the Welsh Office, the Scottish Education Department, the local authority associations, the teacher associations or research organisations. But equally it can only be performed with the co-operation of members of all such bodies.

But, whilst renouncing any suggestions that we are associated with any specific policies or professional interests, I would argue that implicit in our aims are the following propositions, both of which help in discussing my second main theme, the present position of educational administration and its study and practice in this country.

The first proposition I put before you is

> that educational administration, despite its activities ranging from those of nursery school to those of the university nevertheless has an identity, residing in the unique relationship between teacher and taught, which marks it off as a field of study, practice and training from other forms of administration, whether public administration, social administration or local government administration

This is not to say that educational administrators should not study or work, as part of their career development, in these fields. Of course it is desirable that they should do so, and equally desirable that administrators working in public administration, social administration or local government administration should study or work within educational administration. To a degree, I would argue that this is also the case in respect of business and commercial management. What we need to do, and a beginning might be made in our discussions during this conference, is to map out which aspects of the administration of education must necessarily be treated within the setting of education (e.g. the administration of the curriculum, the personnel function in respect of both teaching and non-teaching staff, the recruitment, organisation and assessment of pupil and student populations and their social welfare) and which aspects benefit from being considered in settings shared with the other forms of administration I have mentioned.

The second proposition I put forward is

> that systematic study and planned experience is desirable in those holding administrative positions

There are few who now would argue that being a head, a principal or an education officer calls for no form of study or structured experience. But we still have to establish - and this is certainly

very much our concern, as members of this Society - what forms of study and what forms of planned experience constitute the kind of professional development we ought to be aiming at. This also is an area in which we can do some preliminary mapping during this conference.

Given that the two propositions I have set out can be accepted in general terms, I think we can then move on to my third purpose which is to consider what needs to be done in the next seven years.

Here I think that we must be more positive than we have been hitherto and should unashamedly take on the role of a vigorous pressure group in:

arguing the case for more recognition and more resources to be made available to existing institutions concerned with the professional development of administrators

supporting the setting up of more departments of educational administration in universities and polytechnics and other institutions and supporting also schemes devised by local education authorities, DES and schools

pressing for the recognition and qualifications in educational administration, whether these be degrees, diplomas or other awards as factors of significance to be taken into account in appointment and promotion to administrative positions

preparing the ground for a national policy on the recruitment and professional development of educational administrators

exploring the case for opportunities for administrative studies to be made available for those who are not professional administrators, but who are closely involved in the administration of education, whether as local authority representatives, school governors or members of voluntary bodies concerned with education

I shall now deal with these in turn.

Greater recognition of the need for more resources to be made available to existing institutions

One of the features of the scene in this country is the very wide diversity of institutions now concerned with providing courses in educational administration and management. These include not only universities and polytechnics but also institutions and colleges of higher education. Added to these are various forms of experience based programmes and ad hoc conferences and seminars; whilst many aspects of educational administration and management form part of the normal in-service provision for teachers furnished by local education authorities. All lack the adequate financial support which makes even medium term planned development possible; some, like the scheme for university administration grant-aided by the University Grants Committee, have been starved out of existence. We need to give whatever support we can to existing courses and similar activities and also to the equally important on-the-job schemes of training developed by some local authorities and institutions of higher education.

Above all there is an imperative need for resources to be made available for the building up of a cadre of teaching and research staff to serve both courses of various kinds and also on-the-job training. Within our concept of professional development we need to find room for the preparation of those, whether migrants from industrial management or from orthodox teaching appointments in schools or higher education institutions, or from administrative positions who need to re-tool to prepare themselves for work in a

field in which so much needs to be done. Perhaps particularly do we need to gain support for the view that practising administrators in mid-career should be able to acquaint themselves with administrative practice in at least one other country than their own.

I put forward the proposition

> that a major pre-occupation of this Society should be with the professional development of those entering upon teaching or research in our field; and with ensuring that they have adequate opportunities for planned study and travel.

Supporting the setting up of new university departments, departments in polytechnics and other agencies

A central function of a Society such as our own must surely be the bringing to public and professional attention of the need for the provision of more teaching departments in universities and polytechnics. There are simply not enough to ensure the effective replacement of those who retire to take up other appointments: nor to permit the healthy exchange of ideas.

I suggest:

> that this might be an important missionary task for our local branches to perform and one which might be attempted through local working parties set up to examine possibilities and prepare papers for general discussion at a regional conference. Such papers might embody the results of a survey of existing provision and likely demand within the area in question.

Securing the recognition of qualifications in educational administration

There are no required qualifications in educational administration

at the present time. That is, there is no requirement by any employing body that the candidate for any kind of administrative appointment should possess a degree, a diploma or a certification in administration or should have followed any planned course of initiation or preparation. On the other hand, courses leading to such awards, where offered by universities, polytechnics (as, for example, CNAA degree or Diplomas) are offered on the assumption that they will benefit professionally those who take them. To some extent this is a satisfactory situation for a new field, since it permits the maximum experimentation and ensures that there is a healthily competitive market situation.

The situation in the United States is of course very different, since there many positions are closed save to those who have a Master's degree in educational administration. We would, I am sure, all recoil from the prospect of such a situation developing in this country: and some of our American friends would be the first to warn us against the disadvantages of a degree-bound structure. But nevertheless, in some other countries (Australia, Canada, India, Nigeria) there is a growing acceptance of degrees in educational administration as prerequisites for at least some administrative positions. Elsewhere, for example, in France and Sweden, prescribed programmes, combining both study and experiences, have been instituted by government departments for those already selected for responsible positions.

I suggest:

> that this Society should, as I indicated earlier, urge that qualifications earned through study should be taken into account in the appointment and promotion of administrative personnel. To this it would not be difficult for all members of the Society to agree, since this much follows from our stated aims.

I suggest also:

that, if we agree that a significant value should be attached to qualifications earned through study we should accept that ultimately, and not too far ahead, there will be need to set up our own advisory committee to survey and comment on provision of all kinds.

Such action is commonplace among societies similar to our own. The terms of reference of such a committee might be to trace the ways in which the present situation has come about, to examine the relationship between general and functional courses, and to prepare the ground for:

the formation of national policy on the recruitment, professional development and career structure of those holding administrative posts in education.

Such a policy would be for the government, the local authorities and the professional associations to devise, but this Society, by reason of the freedom it possesses as an organisation of individuals, is well equipped to initiate debate.

As a focus for such a debate, I suggest:

that consideration should be given to the desirability of there being at some time in the future an Education Administration and Management Council which would advise on and ultimately validate awards and schemes of professional development.

A Council of this kind might well be of great assistance to the Council for National Academic Awards and also relieve the Local Government Training Board of some of its onerous responsibilities.

Is such a development conceivable? Perhaps not, but the inconceivable can very speedily become the commonplace.

I do not think that we can avoid taking part in the formation of

national policy in this area. By our very existence we are doing this already

> extending the range of administrative education and understanding.

Quite properly our main focus as a society is on the needs and interests of those who occupy professional roles. But we are the British Society for Educational Administration and not the British Society of Educational Administrators. In short, like the Royal Institute for Public Administration, on whose aims our own are fairly closely modelled, we are concerned with the general diffusion of knowledge relating to - in our case - a particular field of administration. Thus we are concerned, not only with those occupying professional roles, but also with those, whether elected representatives or appointed persons, who are actively involved in decision-making in relation to education. Indeed with the coming of more widely accepted interpretations of participation, we are concerned, by implication, with parents, students and citizens at large.

It would seem to me essential to bear this consideration in mind, since there is inevitably the possibility of tension between the trend towards the professionalisation of administration on the one hand and the trend towards more widespread participation on the other.

I suggest then:

> that in all our deliberations we bear in mind that the administration of the education service is the concern of very many who are neither professional administrators nor teachers and should seek to ensure that at least some of our activities take this into account.

Finally, I should like to place what I have said in an international context. There is still in many countries, and not only in countries

represented on the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and those involved in the European Forum, a lively interest in what this Society is doing. The issues I have set out for consideration are issues which concern other countries also and what we have to say will carry an authority which may surprise those who do not appreciate the regard which is still accorded to British education abroad.

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - WILL IT WORK?

William Bree,
Deputy Director General of the British Institute of Management

In presenting this paper, I will attempt to establish as the basis for our following discussion four principles:

1. That administrators and managers - whether they practise in industry, commerce, national or local government, or even the Church - require a similar understanding of the tools and techniques available from theory and practice in order to achieve the objectives of their organisation.

2. That the function that these people perform wherever it is practised has to be sufficiently professional to be seen as not harmful to the aims of society, and preferably beneficial.

3. That in order for the practitioner to become professional in 'managing' as a function, that person requires a basic educational framework which permits and encourages continuous learning throughout his professional career from a variety of sources.

4. That the professional administrator or manager, in order to maintain public esteem and job satisfaction in a turbulent environment - has to join forces with other professionals to secure an understanding and appreciation by the public of the value of the work they do.

My presumption in presenting these four principles is based on a life-long involvement in management both in practice and research. My practice (that is the way I earn my living) has been in industry

and commerce - but I have spent two periods in research and consultancy - one with the Industrial Society and the other with the British Institute of Management.

My interests in education have been both personal in that my three children all received the benefits of State Education; and also as part of my work in management education.

I have now carried my involvement to the extent that for the past five years I have been a Governor of the North East London Polytechnic, and Chairman of the Policy Committee of the Anglian Regional Management Centre.

1. The Common Basis of 'Managing'

In an increasingly pluralistic society - where the search for identity is raised to the same level of endeavour as the search for the Golden Fleece or the Holy Grail - it is fashionable to define purpose in narrower and narrower terms - and by this sub-division the rationale for a new set or sub-set of clubs, societies or clans - or movement in the generic sense.

I do not wish to attempt to justify or oppose this development. I only wish to establish that in the long climb from the primeval age, Man has learnt some truths which it would be foolish to ignore. Those that concern me are to do with human organisation, motivation and the satisfaction of needs, and the effective utilisation of resources - both human and material. I need not persuade this audience, I am sure, that there exists a mammoth memory on these subjects that is available through reading to any student who wishes to learn the common language of managing through the past 50 or even 100 years.

The application may differ from time to time, and place to place - this is not sufficient to demolish the principal argument. It also does not mean that practitioners must blindly accept and follow the dogma of the founding fathers.

2. The Benefit to Society

This common basis of theory and practice once learnt, has to be seen - by society - to be applied beneficially. Industrial management doesn't come out of that exploration very well at the present time. It is indeed fashionable to scoff at some recently revealed practices of very professional managers and use that as a further reason for separation - a 'cordon sanitaire' if you like - between other professional workers and industrial management.

But I would remind you that there have been other periods when industry, managers and workers alike were seen to be saviours of the nation - and all professionals because their skills are so necessary and therefore exposed to public investigation are liable to undergo similar swings in public esteem. Nevertheless, society can whilst exercising external vigilance through its watchdog, the Press, be quite lenient, to aberrations of conduct or behaviour. Indeed, where would the popular Press be without the more salacious aspects of unprofessional conduct? But society also will not bestow professional status on an individual or group whose work is considered harmful or against the public interest. Thus it is a pre-requisite of any professional body to establish the means of discipling its own aberrant members.

Management is getting quite used to being the whipping boy for many of the ills of Western society. I feel that teachers are losing some of their awe and esteem that the profession was able to draw upon in times past. Perhaps you would like to comment on the reasons for that in discussion - because if true, the profession has itself to take steps to improve its image.

3. Continuing Education

If we agree - so far - that: first there is a common body of knowledge available to all those whose job is 'managing' and secondly this knowledge must be applied beneficially for the profession to be recognised - how then should the professional person be equipped

to acquire and then dispense his professional skills?

Some practitioners may still believe in and practise the art and science of learning by 'sitting next to Nellie'. When I first entered management in 1949 it was still generally believed that personal qualities distinguished success or failure as a manager. The highest personal quality required for success was, of course, leadership - and I believe that lesson is being re-learnt today. But like all dogmas it had its heretics and even in those days there were managers who believed that management could be taught.

Thus we eventually in the mid-60s produced the first Business Schools and now, of course, there are many more both in University and further education sectors. In business management today, are taught the basic skills of numeracy and literacy in order to communicate in management. These skills in the main stem from single disciplines. But to comprehend the ambiguity of business and management - other techniques of a multi-disciplinary nature are added - an example would be subjects like Business Policy, or Corporate Planning, or EDP. Finally - and this is a most recent development - is added project-based learning or 'action learning'. The technique stems from the idea that managers (and others for that matter) learn best by making their own mistakes, by tackling live problems. Problem solving and problem identification (the latter is even more important for a manager) are no longer considered sufficiently testing in real life situations to be dependable - though, of course, many Harvard based courses in management are still based on case analysis.

In 'action learning' - not being a simple single discipline, processes and practices do vary somewhat. The student is enmeshed usually with a project team in a real management problem either in his own organisation or in a completely disparate working environment. His ability is judged therefore not in academic terms entirely - though in the Masters Degree provided by the Anglian Regional Management Centre there is a taught element - but in achieving

a successful conclusion to a real life problem. We have shown that these newer techniques of learning can have application in a number of different 'managing' environments. One of the earliest evangelists of 'action learning' - Professor Reg Revans - did most of his early research in hospital administration before applying his techniques to business management. More recently they have been successfully applied to different cultures in various parts of the world.

I would maintain that through the common body of knowledge - modified of course to include the precise knowledge of the technology required to manage successfully in the function concerned - added to the application of the newer methods of learning by doing: the manager or administrator in whatever function can aspire to become truly professional. Thus I do not believe in separate but equal professional development - the knowledge, techniques and skills of all concerned with the 'managing' function must be shared - one group learning from another - experimenting in their own field and then passing new knowledge on to other groups. The world we inhabit is too complex to permit the establishment of cells of monastic indifference where the only real concern is the number of angels that can be seated on a pin.

Neither do I believe that segregation can maintain equality - the history of negro education in the USA proves that. In this country the separation of further education for senior Civil Servants and Trade Union officials into separate schools from the Business Schools has already done much to harm the understanding of each other's problems and thus the economic recovery of the country. If we in industry are to understand more of the problems facing teachers and administrators in education, and if you in education are to understand the issues facing industrial management and - dare I hope - encourage more of your brighter, more creative pupils to consider a career in business and industry, then it is essential that our development as managers and administrators has at least a common understanding and at best common institutions and sources of new knowledge and insights.

4. A Federation of Management Bodies

This brings me to my last principle. The Principle of conjoint action or affiliation among professional bodies. It is axiomatic that the work we devote our lives to, offers a degree of job satisfaction that prevents our moving to another occupation. Sometimes the link comes under severe pressure I admit, but for the professional it usually holds. But there is today another Key element in maintaining a minimal degree of job satisfaction and that emanates from the external environment. Society today in all countries with sophisticated methods of communication accepts pressure groups - not necessarily greedy or aggressive in promoting their interests - but seeking identification and public acknowledgement of their cause. Professional bodies and societies are drawn into this arena. Many are totally unprepared for the shock of explaining their motives and justifying their activities. They will have to become more expert to survive.

With a public which, on the basis of higher educational attainments is a questioning public; with the passing of the 'deferential society' and with a per capita level of disposable income never before experienced in these islands, our clients and consumers are becoming more and more inquisitive. This has rightly been nominated as 'the century of the common man' though many idealists now facing him are not so ecstatic as they once were. The professional in all walks of life is now on his mettle. The Great Debate in Education has just been joined - the Greater Debate on the future of the professions is about to begin.

We in the British Institute of Management have for the past two years been preparing ourselves for this issue. In October 1976 we adopted a representational role whilst maintaining our professional status in a new Foundation. Since then, other professional bodies have shown considerable interest in a form of affiliation - primarily under the representational banner - though other benefits are seen to flow when such bodies come together. We believe this

is the way not only to continue 'to develop the art and science of management and public education therein' which is enshrined in British Institute of Management articles - but also to enhance the status and public esteem of our profession against competing interests in an increasingly strident and complex world. Our knowledge and experience is available to your members should you wish to examine some of these issues together. Perhaps it is still too early for you to decide the path you might follow - I can only hope I have offered you some thoughts which will contribute to that decision when it is made.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Ron Glatter,
Professor of Educational Administration and Management,
The Open University.

My brief from the conference organisers was to give personal views on possible future developments in the field of educational administration, and on the possible role of BEAS. Also to provoke discussion on issues related to the theme of the Conference.

I interpret the request for personal views as meaning that I have been granted the luxury of being reflective, discursive, even a little disjointed, in my presentation. It is perhaps an appropriate time for me to be granted this luxury. I came into the study and teaching of educational administration after a period as a humble administrator. I like the term 'humble administrator'. The Chinese like it too. With their love of absurd contradiction, they have named a public park in the centre of one of their major cities, 'The Garden of Humble Administrators'. It is presumably one of the wonders of the world, and I should dearly like to see it before I die.

As I was saying, I came into this field when, as a humble administrator, I felt the need to understand something of the processes in which I was engaged. Recently, I have joined the ranks of those many thousands in middle management positions in educational institutions of all kinds. My sympathy for this beleaguered group has never been greater. At least I now have a new vantage point, as part provider and part potential client, from which to reflect, however schizophrenically, on the value of our work in the professional development of administrators.

Although I was asked to speak on future developments, I shall not attempt anything like a projection. I simply want to extend discussion on the issues which George Baron introduced yesterday,

and to raise some further ones: they are issues which seem important to me and which appear to pose significant choices for the future. I shall draw quite heavily on some of the papers which were prepared for the 1978 International Intervisitation Programme (IIP), because I think these help to crystallize our own position and possible future directions. I shall also, as requested, try to suggest some implications for the future roles of BEAS.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I should like first to discuss briefly the notion of 'professional development'. The organising committee have, in my view, rightly, seen this Conference as only one in a series of activities related to this theme. For example, the first Conference of the European Forum in Educational Administration in 1980 will take professional development as its subject. So we need to consider some of the implications of the term.

In recent years, the professions have had, on the whole, a bad press. They have come to be associated in the public mind, with exclusiveness, with restrictive practice, with a tendency to erect barriers of 'psychobabble' [1] between themselves and their clients. Indeed, I find I share some of these prejudices when I am a client of other professions! At a time when some of the most important discussions in our field are concerned with how to involve constituencies other than professionals in educational decision-making, we should be wary of seeming to want to drive a further wedge between ourselves and our clients. If we do, we may very well get an increasing number of retorts such as the following, from the Director of the Advisory Centre for Education. However misconceived it might seem to you, it could well be expressing a growing unease about some aspects of the approach which many of us here represent:

> 'Concentration on curriculum reform, on the minutiae of school administration and timetabling, and attempts

> to turn school management and pastoral care into sciences rather than arts, tend to increase the mystification of schooling and inhibit the involvement of parents and pupils.'[2]

A text, perhaps, for some of our group discussions later on today?

It seems to me that there are clear dangers here, and I am glad that George Baron reminded us yesterday that the name of our Society includes the term 'Administration' rather than 'Administrators'. But we have gone further than this. We said from the beginning that membership is open to anyone who is actively interested in pursuing our aims. Yet we have not so far managed to broaden our membership base beyond those who are employed in education. Here, I would suggest, is an important task for the future. As a minimum, we should seek to bring into membership at least a few of the many local councillors around the country who have made education one of their specialities; similarly with Members of Parliament. Other groups will readily suggest themselves: active members of school and college governing bodies and community associations, non-educationalists who sit on committees, commissions and working parties at local and national level. Our discussions would benefit greatly from the perspectives brought by these groups, and we would be capitalising further on one of our main strengths, the absence of any formal requirements for entry, itself a powerful rebuttal of any charge of exclusiveness.

The same point applies to the provision of courses. If our teaching and training efforts are not to result in ever-growing barriers of incomprehension between professionals and lay people, we shall need to take steps to ensure that those non-educationists who are becoming involved in decision-making are provided with at least a modicum of understanding of the problems of educational management. We will have to recognise that such provision will often bring us into a richly political environment in a way that our more traditional courses do not. Recently the Department of

Education and Science agreed to fund an Open University course and associated research project related to the training of school governors and managers, which is to be directed by Roy McHugh and myself. Immediately 'The Daily Telegraph' which previously (perhaps fortunately) had taken little notice of courses in educational administration and management, favoured us with precious space in its leader column, accusing us of preparing to educate 'a breed of professional naggers, no doubt well schooled in the latest sociological jargon'. The news report informed us, much to our surprise, what our primary objective is supposed to be: 'the course will train parent governors in how they can most effectively "meddle" in school affairs'. [3]

The general point here is that the term 'professional development' may be too restrictive to cover all the relevant activities and types of clientele. But even if, for the moment, we limit our focus to those who are employed in education, what profession is it that we are talking about? The educational profession? A profession of administrators and managers? Or a sub-profession of one or the other?

Here, one of the papers prepared for the International Intervisitation Programme is of interest. It was based on reviews of arrangements for selecting and training educational administrators in various areas of the world. Dr. John Andrews of the University of British Columbia proposed four descriptive categories of models. [4] The first two categories, which he called the Non-Professional and Non-Educational Models respectively, are of little relevance for our purposes here. The third model was called the Generic Professional model. This is 'based centrally on the teaching profession. Administrators are promoted from the pool of experienced teachers ... Where training does exist it is usually not extensive and reliance is placed primarily on experience in the job'. By contrast, the fourth model, called the Specialist Professional model, 'sees educational administration as a sub-profession growing out of the teaching profession'. [5] Appointments to senior positions, even within schools, are made

from the pool of those who have successfully completed an extensive graduate programme in educational administration: this may be a formal requirement, or alternatively might simply have become the accepted practice. This model is of course most notably found in the United States, whereas Andrews places Britain in the third category, the Generic Professional. The issue is whether these models are expressions of the specific social contexts in which they arise, or whether they are stages of development progressing inevitably towards the Specialist Professional model. Andrews contends that, with some qualifications, the evidence both from current movements around the world and from the sociology of occupations suggests that the 'inevitable progression' explanation is the appropriate one, and he specifically names Britain as one of the countries apparently on the move from Model 3 to Model 4.

Such an analysis is clearly highly relevant to any discussion of professional development. My own conclusion would not be as deterministic as Andrew's, or perhaps I am simply an optimist. I assume that we can intervene even against seemingly inexorable forces - that indeed is often what educational management is all about. But first we must ask the question which the analysis poses - should educational administration in Britain become a sub-profession in the American style?

The implications of such a development are well enough known. One of the reasons why management training has been slow to get off the ground in continental Europe, according to Dalin, is the fear of teachers and their unions that this will lead to powerful management at the headteacher and local authority levels, thus threatening classroom teacher autonomy. [6] In Britain, these levels already have considerable power. Would the arrival of Model 4 in Britain therefore lead to even more serious diversions between administrators and teachers than the Europeans fear, or would it simply ensure that staff at these levels had the mangerial knowledge and skills needed to perform their significant roles within the system?

Whatever the apparent danger, it is hard to envisage educational administration in Britain being solely based on Model 3 - the Generic Professional. One of the sub-themes for this Conference is 'Who are the educational administrators?' I have already considered this question elsewhere, [7] so will not labour it here. But we should not forget that many administrators in the education service, including many members of the Society, are not qualified teachers and would probably not regard themselves as educators. Many administrators in higher and further education institutions come into this category, as do quite a number in LEAs. Yet they are clearly educational administrators with needs for professional development, and they would fit into Model 4 of Andrew's categorization rather than Model 3.

I shall be coming back to some of these points later. My intention here was imply to look a little more closely at a few of the problems which arise when the term 'professional development' is applied to educational management.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN NORTH AMERICA AND EUROPE

The introspection which is taking place at this Conference comes at a time when a major re-appraisal is underway in North America, and when there are significant new developments in continental Europe, most notably, but by no means exclusively, in Sweden. It seems to me that we should conduct our own debates with some awareness of these developments, and so I hope you will forgive me if I spend a little time considering them.

In the USA, the first academic course in educational administration was offered over 70 years ago, and there are now some 375 higher education institutions offering courses in the field. [8] In a wide-ranging and scholarly survey presented at the IIP, Dr. Jack Culbertson, Executive Director of the University Council for Educational Administration, challenged many of the assumptions on which the recent development of the subject in the USA has been based. In particular, he suggested that in attempting to build a discipline of

administration in the 1950s and 1960s, implicitly modelled on the disciplines in the natural and social sciences, 'we were aping the wrong model'.[9] Educational administration was not a discipline in this traditional sense but an applied professional field of study more akin to law and medicine. A 'theory of practice' was needed, 'directly linked to administrator effectiveness in education'.[10] This should be based much more than in the past on the special features of leadership, management and change in educational institutions, rather than relying on 'general theories drawn largely from the social sciences and the broad literature of administration'.[11] Because of the nature of educational debate, the 'theory of practice' must encompass values as well as facts (hence the recent prominence of policy studies in the USA). Inductive or field-based modes of inquiry, such as case studies, can be as valuable as deductive, theory-based modes.

It seemed to me that this fundamental questioning of the whole drift of research and training in North America over the past twenty years was not simply an idiosyncratic appraisal by one man. In fact, another paper, by Dr. Jean Hills of the University of British Columbia, which was rather more astringent in tone, made similar points, emphasising even more strongly the applied nature of our field and the view that its primary orientation should be clinical, focussing on the management of practical processes and seeking solutions to concrete, practical problems.[12]

It was noteworthy that Culbertson's paper was full of references to courses and projects in many other parts of the world, most of them, of course, of recent origin, and often using models and assumptions quite different from the traditional American ones, which were virtually the only models available until about fifteen years ago. It seemed clear that the re-appraisal was being considerably influenced by growing knowledge of these alternative approaches. I do not mean to sound in any way arrogant, nor to undervalue the significance of the paper, when I say that the specific proposals made in it correspond very closely to what has been our thinking in this country since work first began here in

this field some thirteen years ago. Nearly all the points were included, for instance, in the recommendations I put forward (based partly on a study of American practice) in the book published in 1972 which concluded the project supported by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. [13] Apart from the emergence of alternative models from abroad, another powerful influence, of course, has been the paper by Greenfield presented at the British IIP in 1974, [14] debate on which has been kept very much alive over the past four years in the pages of our journal as well as in North American publications. [15]

Perhaps the most significant point made by Culbertson in the context of our discussions this weekend concerns the implications of his analysis for training programmes. The American approach, he points out, has been based on an academic rather than a professional practice model of training.

> 'The culminating activity in the (Ph.D.) program was directed at scholarship through the dissertation and not as in the professional practice model of medicine, for example, of case history analysis, the internship and residency practice. Would it not be desirable for leaders in some nations during the next two decades to develop and test professional training models that are more intimately and systematically related to practice contexts? Such developmental work might provide alternative training models within the international arena ...' [16]

One such model, although it is still at a very early stage of development, seems worth commenting on here, because in its objectives and structure it appears to be almost at the opposite pole from the American approach. This is the so-called 'PLUS' programme in Sweden, a national in-service training programme for school heads and deputies which began in 1975 after pre-testing. It is intended that all heads in Sweden will take the Programme within the next nine years. [17]

According to Dalin, the recent growth of training in educational management in continental Europe is a reflection of the inability of traditional centralised structures to cope with modern problems which need to be tackled on the ground. Larger, more complex and dynamic schools, urbanisation with its attendant social problems, students' earlier maturation, unemployment, economic instability: such forces cannot be managed simply by central laws and regulations. Authority must be delegated, and school leaders must possess the capability of dealing with these problems locally, [18] if the following description of the ideal Swedish school head, 1978-style, is accurate, it marks a radical shift in the traditional conception of the European school administrator.

> 'The basic assumption is that the school leader plays an important role in the development of a healthy school. He should in many ways be a change agent, or at least a facilitator of change. His role is to co-ordinate initiatives, work closely with both staff and students, and be open for community involvement.' [19]

Thus the PLUS programme is explicitly intended to make an impact on what happens in school. This is its raison d'etre. Also, it is concerned as much with changing and improving attitudes and relationships as with promoting administrative efficiency. The logical consequences of this for course design are that other staff, not just the head, must be involved in some way in the activity, and that off-the-job training can have only a limited and supporting function within the overall programme.

The programme as a whole lasts almost two years, but only a total of 25 days of this is spent in so-called 'course' periods, that is, off-the-job, residential 'blocks' of between two and five days each. There are seven of these blocsk scattered through the programme, and they serve mainly to prepare the ground for the work which the members will do back in their schools during the 'home' periods. Here, they continue to perform most of their normal duties, but also undertake various observational and analytical assignments

relating to the school and its neighbourhood, and, in the second year of the programme, they plan and carry out some major innovation or development in conjunction with their staff. Participants also spend two weeks working in a local industrial organisation, and two weeks with social services in the locality. Although the programme is a national one, there is a headquarters staff of only two - Eskil Stegö and Mats Ekholm - and the planning and training are done by teams in eight regions, each of which has a large measure of responsibility for the programme in its own area. A parallel, though shorter, programme for teachers at lower levels, also focused on organisational change and development is under way.

A group drawn from the Programme's headquarters staff and regional teams visited several institutions providing courses in educational management in this country earlier this year, and a number of participants here will have been able to discuss the programme with members of the group. My own conclusions were that it was an experiment from which we may be able to learn a good deal (a detailed evaluation is being made). The discussions made me more aware of the advantages (the disadvantages are well enough known) of a situation in which the training body and the employer are one and the same agency: in this situation, off- and on-the-job training can be linked together more readily, though still with difficulty. Also, because the training is given after appointment, is compulsory, and does not lead to a credential, it is not likely to be bound up with individual career aspirations in the way that training is both in America and in this country. It will be interesting to see whether this helps or hinders motivation, but it is surely likely to concentrate participants' attention on the intrinsic rather than the extrinsic purposes of the Programme.

Lastly, although the PLUS programme presents an almost total contrast to the traditional North American model, it has one point in common with it. At least when the programme has been completed in nine years' time, all Swedish heads, like virtually

all of their North American counterparts, will have received a fairly extended period of management training. I would doubt whether, by 1987, more than a modest proportion of British heads will have had such a training, unless some new initiatives are taken soon.

There are, of course, a number of other interesting projects under way on the continent, in particular the 'Curriculum: School Administration' project being conducted by Richard Besoth and Clive Hopes at the German Institute for International Educational Research in Frankfurt. [20] I chose the PLUS programme for my discussion here because it is a national project and because of its attempt to link external and school-based training.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PROVISION AND CONTENT

I think this brief excursion to look at two other sets of arrangements, one developed very much earlier than our own, the other rather later, can help us in our own search for guidelines. First, let us consider provision. The British provision, as summarised in the paper given by George Baron and Meredydd Hughes at the IIP, [21] is clearly something of a patchwork quilt. There is an assortment of utterings, in terms of length of course, geographical distribution, whether award-bearing or not, whether focussed on specific roles or sectors or on the educational system as a whole, and so on. Whatever the demerits of the American and Swedish arrangements, they are at least, each in their own way, relatively uniform in pattern and therefore likely to be comprehensible to the user.

I would surmise that our arrangements make it extremely difficult for potential users, or even their employers, to know which kind of course is appropriate for specific needs. I would ask those members of this Conference who are, or have been, users rather than providers whether or not this statement reflects their experience. If this is a serious concern about the way in which our provision is developing, then I think we should take advantage of BEAS' special

blend of practitioners and academics to do something about it. We should set up one or more working parties, possibly by sector, to survey the available provision and prepare guidelines to help potential users. These surveys, which could be based partly on visitations, should cover all types of provision, not simply that offered by higher education institutions but also what is available from LEAs, the DES and other bodies. An important outcome of such an exercise could be the identification of gaps in provision, and suggestions of how they might be filled. An exercise of this kind might well need, and merit, some external funding. It has some similarities to the advisory committee which George Baron proposed yesterday, but that was more of a policy-initiating body, whereas I would wish to stress the 'guidelines to users' aspect at least as strongly.

Still, it would have to be recognised that this would be merely a short-term solution. The management training of senior staff in education is becoming a major issue of public debate. Increasingly, official reports and Ministerial and other political speeches are making reference to this and related issues of professional development. [22] We seem unable or unwilling to take the kind of decisive national action regarded as natural in Sweden, but the time is surely fast approaching when the Government must say whether or not it thinks senior staff in education should receive training related to their managerial roles and if so, how this should be achieved, in particular, within what time-scale. If there is a serious determination to implement the James proposals on in-service training, for example, one of the one-term full-time blocks could be set aside for management training in respect of each member of staff in a responsible position. Such a period would be long enough to provide the necessary distancing without taking the individuals away from their duties for an unreasonable length of time. Such a scheme could give wide coverage, and would therefore be fairly economical. If we wanted to link external and institution-based training, we could do this by running the course for the equivalent of one-term full-time, not necessarily concentrated into a single block, but spaced out in an

appropriate pattern.

This brings me to the crucial issue of content which seems to be raised both by the foreign developments I sketched and by our own current situation. We obviously need to examine whether the terms currently in the air, 'professional practice', 'clinical values' and so on, help us to understand what we are doing and what we ought to be doing. We would all reject, I imagine, simple dichotomies of the kind academic/practical, theoretical/clinical, positivistic/phenomenological. We need, however, to have some idea of where we are going, because I fear that, as we seek to expand provision in the higher education institutions, we may find ourselves under extreme pressure to prove the academic respectability of our subject, as the Americans did in the 1950s. We may be tempted to define it in terms of some more established field or discipline, most probably sociology, and thus gradually lose touch both with colleagues in the education service and with the various clients of that service. It would be ironic, to say the least, if we adopted such an approach at the very time when the Americans were drawing back from it.

There is an alternative view, which we have all heard voiced, formulated in different ways: that a young subject needs protection from practical, day-to-day issues while it is growing; that time spent gathering insights and data from the field takes time away from the development of theories and concepts in the study; or, in some extreme form, that contact with the system is corrupting.

Set against this view the comment by Hills, writing from a North American context, that

> '... a serious, long-range issue is how do we restore legitimacy to a concern for problem solutions? It is curious, from the vantage point of hindsight, that the emergence of an emphasis on social-behavioural science knowledge in our field seemed to require the submergence

> of prescriptive concerns. Perhaps it was a phase that we shall outgrow, but an applied field that uses the phrase "how to do it" pejoratively, and speaks derisively of problem solutions as "bags-of-tricks" is surely an anomaly.' [23]

We do not have theories and concepts to cover all the problems which arise in the management of education. It seems to me that the approach suggested by Culbertson, if there is adequate funding for it, will help us to get far more of them. While we are waiting, we need to clarify our view of what constitutes appropriate knowledge in relation to the professional development of educational administrators.

We need, for instance, to ensure that as our courses become more sophisticated, we do not lose our appreciation of the value of collegial learning, which can provide mutual support and enhance self-confidence, especially where people are working under the strain imposed by many contemporary roles. Cheshire LEA have provided an interesting demonstration of this in their courses which prepare new heads of comprehensive schools, and which include extended 'attachment' periods spent in schools in other parts of the country, observing and analysing practice within them. [24]

We should beware of the arrogance which assumes that if a problem is not dealt with somewhere in the literature, it isn't a problem or at least not one which can be examined in a training context. Pooled experience can provide significant learning: if in addition there are insights available from research or other scholarly enquiry, then that is a bonus rather than a sine qua non.

Then there is the question of the way in which we divide up our field and draw upon various disciplines. Here I believe we have a major job of curriculum development before us. Hills, again, puts the problem neatly:

'... all we have done so far by way of drawing upon the social-behavioural sciences ... is engage in a process of simple aggregation. We have courses in organisation theory, the politics of education, etc., but these tend to be collections of elements of the specific disciplines deemed somehow relevant to the practice of administration. We seem to have done relatively little to integrate these kinds of knowledge with clinical problems and with the other kinds of knowledge necessary to provide approaches to the solution of the problems with which practitioners are confronted. [25]

This is a task which faces us in this country, as elsewhere. It will involve us in looking, more closely than we have done so far, at the nature of administration and the competencies for which it calls. In a paper published in 1974 which I found highly stimulating, James G. March identified five critical administrative skills. They were not put forward as an exhaustive list, but as a group of important skills which might be given far more attention in research and training programmes than they are, and to which some existing academic work is relevant. They were: the skill of dealing with experts, the skill of building coalitions, the skill of making decisions in conditions of great ambiguity and uncertainty, the skill of allocating one's own time, and the skill of analysing data - not for research, but for managing. [26]

This, of course, only gives the briefest summary of what is a very detailed exposition, but I hope it is enough to suggest the kind of approach I believe we should take to the definition of content in our field, and to illustrate the need to get away from what Hills called 'a process of simple aggregation' of elements of the source disciplines.

March's analysis is not, of course, the only possible one. Another interesting set of abilities has been prepared by Theodore Reller, for instance. [27]

Nor does the need for skills or abilities issue forth as though from the void: it is always related to a specific social context, and hence subject to change. Peter Browning, in his IIP paper, identified six current political and social forces in England - politicisation, consumerism, social stress, unemployment, centralism and unionism - and showed how each made fresh demands on the skills and resourcefulness of the local administrator. [28]

TWO DEVELOPING DICHOTOMIES

I should like now to raise two further issues relating to our future directions: the question of policy studies and management studies in education; and the probable increasing differentiation of course provision by sector.

It is becoming more common to speak of two separate areas within educational administration: educational policy and educational management. I believe that this is an unnecessary and misleading dichotomy. What is really meant is, in the case of policy, studies which relate to the government of education, particularly at national level, and in the case of management, studies which relate to the institutions. The status of local government is a little obscure within this dichotomy: it occupies a grey area, sometimes being seen as having something to do with policy and at other times with management (as in 'corporate management'). I would argue that the disciplines on which we draw all have relevant contributions to make at both governmental and institutional levels, though it might be claimed that, say, economics, had more to offer at governmental level. The dichotomy seems to be based on the assumption that institutions do not make policy and that politics do not go on in them, an assumption which the political scientist W.J.M. Mackenzie (among others) demolished some time ago. [29] Conversely, anthropology, which might have been thought to have relevance only to institutional settings, has been brilliantly shown by Heclo and Wildavsky to be applicable

to the innermost workings of central government. [30]

The artificiality of the distinction becomes clear when one considers specific topics for research. No examination of policies for teacher supply, for instance, would be adequate if it were confined to governmental levels alone: it would also need to study how the points system operated, and how teachers were deployed, within schools. Studies of curriculum control must similarly range over all levels. A study of the present-day structure and operation of further education colleges would reveal so much about the effects on government-level policies for the 16 to 19 sector that it could hardly be claimed that it was not a policy study. In the same way, the present study at Sussex University by Professor Briault and his colleagues on the management implications of falling rolls in schools is likely to have considerable policy ramifications.

Under cover of grand labels such as policy and management, we are in danger of erecting a barrier between governments and institutions in education that could be seriously dysfunctional for practice, teaching and research in educational administration. The assumption seems to be, and to my mind it is a misleading one, that political and value questions are settled at the levels of government, whereas operating an institution is largely a matter of technique, whether managerial or professional. The separation of values from techniques always seems to me potentially dangerous.

The resurgence of the phenomenological perspective should surely have reminded us that any analysis of high-level policy must encompass those humble actors who can make or break it. As John Tomlinson wrote recently, when reviewing a book on educational innovation.

> '... those who have been moving, often from instinct and insight, towards making educational thinking and change a connected continuum - not a dichotomy of

'policy makers' and 'operatives' - may have stumbled upon a right path.'[31]

A second dichotomy which is developing, and is likely to go on doing so, seems to me to have rather stronger justification. This is the increasing differentiation in course provision between the sectors; that is, either between schools and post-school institutions or between higher education institutions and the rest. This trend has gone considerably further in the United States, where the term 'educational administration' often appears to mean simply 'administration of, or relating to, schools' and there are separate departments of higher education, whose members, it is sometimes alleged, have little or no contact with the departments of educational administration on the same campus. Something similar appears to be happening in Australia. In this country, the differentiation has not gone so far, although there are more and more courses, both on teaching and administration, specifically related to higher education. Within general courses in educational administration, there seems to be a growth of options in, say, school or college organisation.

To a considerable extent, this differentiation seems to me to reflect real differences in purpose, context and content between compulsory and post-compulsory education. At the same time, the further this trend goes, the greater will be the danger of weakening the articulation between the compulsory and post-compulsory sectors, and of reducing the opportunities for comparative analysis of different types of institution which the undifferentiated course provides. This is an issue well worth discussing further at this conference.

A BROADER CONCEPT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

So far, I have been speaking of professional development almost entirely in terms of courses. I should like to mention one other aspect, namely job mobility, both between academic and

practitioner roles and between various kinds of position in education management. As long ago as 1965, the Heyworth report which led to the establishment of the Social Science Research Council, proposed that 'split careers' - people moving between academic and practitioner roles during their careers - should become far more common. This has happened a good deal less than was hoped - though in our field there have been some noteworthy examples. The development of the professional practice model would imply much more of this kind of movement, and an easing of the barriers associated with secondments, exchanges and the like.

But the question of mobility is a much wider one than simply helping to bridge the gap between theory and practice, important though that is. Particularly now, when normal mobility through promotion is very limited, there should be much greater provision for people to move round the system. An interesting plan was put forward in the press recently for an exchange-and-transfer scheme for polytechnic lecturers.[32] Acceptance of periodic movement of school heads, whether to other headships or other roles in the system seems a much more constructive, professionally developing approach than the various suggestions for limited tenure.[33]

Since this society is concerned with all sectors and branches of the service, and has a particular interest in professional development, we might do well to take up this question of mobility in the shape of exchanges, secondments and transfers, to study the possibilities and to seek their positive encouragement and the removal of the barriers to them. Even if it is only half true, the statement that 'Most people are where they are at the moment because they are stuck there'[34] suggests a condition so serious that some drastic remedies are needed to deal with it. The kinds of measures that might be introduced would not only remove a great deal of frustration and anguish; they might also help to build a more unified service with more of its members understanding how different branches of it operate and the roles they perform.

A determined effort in this direction would meet severe obstacles. Such schemes would primarily benefit individuals on the one hand, and the service as a whole on the other: the benefits to institutions would be less obvious or direct, so the doctrine of institutional autonomy would come powerfully into play. It would be a test of the capacity of our atomised system to deal with an acute problem of professional development which demands a concerted national approach.

CONCLUSION

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that at the beginning I promised you a talk that would be discursive and disjointed. I think you will agree that I have been as good (or as bad) as my word. To end, I would like to put forward one more thought about the British Educational Administration Society. I have made several suggestions this morning about issues which the Society might tackle, and many others will be made during this weekend. In terms of activities, there is a clear case for the development of interest groups - one on the primary school is overdue, for example, and would help to develop work in that neglected area.

But I hope we do not leave here this weekend without having said something about the basic purposes of the Society: unless we do, coherent policy decision, for example about the nature and format of future Annual Conferences, cannot be taken. Are we, for example, simply a forum in which all sections of the service meet to exchange experiences and views? This is a very useful function, not performed elsewhere, but I do not think that, by itself, it is enough to sustain a Society intellectually. I believe that our distinctive interest lies in the systematisation and generalisation of knowledge about educational administration and that, as individual members, we wish to pursue this aim aside from our particular interest or role-group affiliations. That seems to me to provide a strong rationale for our existence, and firm base for the

development of our activities.

REFERENCES

1 Reed, C., 'The psychobabble enigma' in The Guardian, 14 January 1978; see also Rosen, R.D. (1977) Psychobabble - Fast Talk and Quick Cure in the Era of Feeling, Athenaeum, New York.

2 Newell, P. (1978) 'Sheep, goats and governors' in The Times Educational Supplement, 7 July.

3 The Daily Telegraph, 7 July 1978. See also reply by the author in the issue of 11 July.

4 Andrews, J.H.M. (1978) 'International perspectives in the preparation of educational administrators', paper presented at the Fourth International Intervisitation Programme in Educational Administration (IIP), Vancouver, Canada.

5 Ibid. p.7.

6 Dalin, P. (1978) 'Preparation of Educational Administrators in Europe - present and future perspectives', paper presented at the Fourth IIP, (see note 4), p.3.

7 Glatter, R. (1972) Management Development for the Education Profession, London, Harrap. (Now distributed by the NFER Publishing Company, Windsor.)

8 Culbertson, J. (1978) 'Educational Administration: Where we are and where we are going', paper presented at the Fourth IIP, p.1.

9 Ibid. p.8.

10 ibid, p. 9.

11 ibid, p. 8.

12 Hills, J. (1978) 'Critical issues in the preparation of educational administrators in North America', paper prepared for the Fourth IIP, p.4.

13 Glatter, R., op cit.

14 Greenfield, T.B. (1975)

15 See, for instance: 'Barr Greenfield and Organisation Theory: A Symposium' in Educational Administration, Vol. 5, No. 1, Autumn 1976, pp. 1-13; Greenfield, T.B. (1978) 'Where does Self belong in the study of Organisation: response to a symposium' in Educational Administration, Vol. 6, No. 1, Winter 1977/78, pp. 81-102; Greenfield, T.B. (1976) 'Theory about What? Some more thoughts about theory in educational administration', in UCEA Review, Vol. XVII, No. 2, February.

16 Culbertson, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

17 See Ekholm, M. (1977) School Leader Education in Sweden: basic assumptions and some notations on the factual situation, School Leader Education, Box 249, 581 02 Linköping, Sweden; and Stego, N.E. (1978) The Role of the School Leader: basic thoughts behind the curriculum of a training programme for school leaders (publication details as above item).

18 Dalin, op. cit., p.4.

19 ibid, p. 5.

20 Hopes, C. (1978) 'Educational Administration in the Federal Republic of Germany and the Professional Development of School Administrators', paper prepared for the Fourth IIP, pp. 20-26.

21 Baron, G. and Hughes, M. (1978) 'Preparation programmes in the United Kingdom', paper presented to the Fourth IIP.

22 See, for example: Tenth Report from the Expenditure Committee (1977) The Attainments of the School Leaver, HMSO, London, paragraphs 139-42. Also: 'School-based training is Conservative aim' and 'Money saved by closures is to stay in education' in the Times Educational Supplement, 14 July 1978.

23 Hills, J., op.cit., p.13.

24 See Tomlinson, J.R.G. (1978) 'Staff development: comprehensive means everybody' in Department of Education and Science, Comprehensive Education: report of a DES Conference, December 1977, HMSO, pp. 135-40.

25 Hills, op.cit., pp.11-12.

26 March, J.G. (1974). 'Analytical skills and the university training of educational administrators' in The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. XII, No.1, May, 1974, pp.17-44.

27 Reller, T. (1974), Educational Administration in Metropolitan Areas, Phi Delta Kappa, quoted in Hughes, P.L. (1978), 'Projected issues in the preparation of Educational Administrators - Australia', paper presented to the Fourth IIP, pp.11-13.

28 Browning, P. (1978), 'Projected issues in the Practice of Educational Administration: the English Context', paper presented to the Fourth IIP.

29 See Mackenzie, W.J.M. (1967) Politics and Social Science, Pelican.

30 Heclo, H. and Wildavsky, A. (1973) The Private Government of Public Money, Macmillan.

31 Tomlinson, J.L. (1978) 'Edging Forward', book review in Education, 30 June, p.574.

32 Daniel, J., 'Thanks for applying, but we regret to inform ...' in The Times Higher Education Supplement, 7.7.78.

33 See Ransom, M. 'Training heads' in Education, 9.6.78.

34 Daniel, op. cit.

NOTES FROM DISCUSSIONS IN THE PLENARY SESSIONS

Royston McHugh

In each session, after the main speaker had addressed the Conference, members were able to raise questions for clarification and discussion. The following summaries indicate the main points of debate.

THE BRITISH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SOCIETY: THE NEXT SEVEN YEARS

George Baron,
Emeritus Professor of Educational Administration,
University of London.

In the general discussion which followed the talk by Professor Baron a variety of topics were raised. A summary of the main questions put and the views that were expressed are given below.

What is the relationship between Educational Administration and Public Administration? Is Educational Administration unique, has it a separate identity?

Professor Baron re-stated his views that whilst he agreed there was some degree of overlap between the theory and practice in both spheres of administration, nevertheless he felt it was helpful to keep educational administration as a separate field of study and training because there were many areas of work which could not easily be undertaken by generalist local officers. There was a need for specialists in the field of education to tackle such problems as teacher assessment and to advise on nursery and infant practice. Many participants agreed with the views of Professor Baron although one member suggested the main question was not one of whether

the two sectors were so different but whether in fact administrative expertise could be taught rather than caught. If it was agreed that it could be taught then there were sound arguments for an initial generalist training alongside colleagues from other spheres of public administration.

Is there a difference between educational administration and educational management?

This question was a follow on from the previous debate and focussed on the possibility of producing training programmes related to different roles in education.

In answer Professor Baron referred to the development of two traditions. Historically the term 'administration' had been used in the University sphere and the local education authorities and followed closely the patterns developed in the United States of America, Canada and Australia. The term 'management' was much more the tradition of the British Polytechnics and Management Centres and was increasingly being used in the schools sector, particularly in relation to the role of headteachers and deputy heads. Although he felt it was important to clearly define the concepts used he saw no real benefits to be gained from trying to differentiate 'educational administration' from 'educational management' in any absolute sense. In his view there was a great degree of overlap between the two terms and the only benefits he saw for preferring the use of the term 'administration', particularly in publications, was to facilitate communication at an international level.

What kind of training should be provided? Are qualifications essential?

The next area of debate focussed on types of training with particular reference to the longer 'all purpose' courses leading to a recognised qualification and other functional courses related to the needs of specialised groups, e.g. Headteachers. Questions were raised about whether it was in the best interests of the profession to lay

stress on career patterns and qualifications, this may well be detrimental to the provision of the most effective training for the 'job in hand'. Whilst acknowledging that qualifications were important, some participants expressed the view that accreditation was very problematical because of the wide variety of people involved, (for example, a College principal or an infant head-teacher) and their diversity of needs at different stages of their career. Accent should be on the provision of the most effective form of training rather than on the qualifications to be gained.

Mention was also made of the desirability of making training for educational administrators compulsory rather than on a voluntary basis as presently organised in the United Kingdom. This led to a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the Swedish and American approaches to professional development, two systems which seem to embody many of the opposing views expressed in the debate. No general agreement was reached on which approach to professional development was to be preferred, however, a view was expressed, which attracted a good deal of support, that clarification and acceptance of a common policy for the United Kingdom would be of benefit to all concerned.

How can training be provided?

One specific suggestion offered was for a National Staff College to provide training for different categories of staff from schools, as well as school governors and managers, and that BEAS should provide the initiative in trying to establish an institution of this kind.

There was very little support for this 'model', many participants feeling it raised difficult issues of control of the profession and selection of candidates for training.

Some support was expressed for the present diversity of training provided by universities, polytechnics, colleges and local education authorities, whilst one member strongly advocated a model of

professional training similar to that provided for magistrates. This would be controlled by a National Board and statutorily provided by local education authorities.

One member questioned whether enough was being done by the 'providers' of training to encourage the employing authorities to take advantage of the training courses already available. In reply to this question Professor Baron acknowledged that much more could be done and stressed that members of BEAS could play a vital role in this respect, because many held important positions of responsibility within the various sectors of the educational service.

During this debate a note of caution was expressed by one participant when he drew attention to the increasing pressures for professionalisation of educational administrators at a time of increasing demands for lay participation in the educational process. He suggested that some form of provision for lay involvement in training programmes was essential if we were to avoid the tensions which could build up in such a situation.

What is the future role of BEAS?

The last major topic of discussion was initiated by Mr. D.P.J. Browning, Past Chairman of BEAS, when he focussed attention on the specific proposals made by Professor Baron in his address. He suggested to members that these raised the major question of what the future role of BEAS was to be. Was the Society to gradually expand and consolidate its influence by continuing to operate within its present policies or was it to adopt an expansionist policy based on a much more vigorous and active pursuit of its ideals. In his view the important point was for members to be clear on which role they wanted the Society to adopt because if the latter course of action was pursued it would certainly mean greater risks and possible conflicts of interests with other organisations.

In summary he felt that whatever the future for BEAS at the present time it was obvious that opinions were divided on many of the questions raised in the discussions. For example, although all members strongly agreed that it was desirable for all educational administrators to participate in a programme of systematic study and planned experiences there was still a diversity of views on what form these should take and whether they should be organised separately from general courses in public administration.

In his view there was an urgent need for a much more systematic and detailed examination of these questions in the United Kingdom and BEAS had a very important role to play in this debate.

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - WILL IT WORK?

William Bree,
Deputy Director General, British Institute of Management.

The questions following William Bree's address focussed on three main areas of interest:

His claim for a common basis for 'managing' and his rejection of separate programmes of professional development for educational administrators.

The need for shared knowledge and experiences and how educationalists can learn from general management training.

The principle of cojoint actions or affiliation between professional bodies, particularly the relationship between BEAS and BIM (British Institute of Management)

If separate training programmes for educational administrators are rejected, how do we overcome the negative attitudes of the separatists?

Mr. Bree reiterated many of the points made in his talk. He stressed that all education was concerned with life and developing social understanding and that managing was a leadership role regardless of the function the manager had to play. Thus in any programme of development participants must be helped to understand the purposes of society and to develop a concept of leadership, or of managing, appropriate to that context. It was essential therefore to provide centres for management education which gave all managers opportunities for continuing education in their chosen vocational role.

Within this framework of the common basis of 'managing' it seemed desirable that the first cycle of education and training should be organised on a generalist basis with perhaps the later cycles of training devoted to specialist needs.

If we accept training programmes should not be separate what influence will this have for what we do for educational administrators?

In any training programme opportunities must exist for participants to observe and analyse other managers at work. They must learn about the problems other managers face and benefit from their experience. Although technologies differ a large number of management strategies can be successfully applied over a variety of contexts. 'Common' solutions can be found to specific problems.

Following the argument of a common basis for 'managing', how necessary is teaching experience for entry to educational administration? What common core of experience is needed for entry to this field? Is there a career pattern and what qualifications are desirable?

Mr. Bree started with the assumption that education had to be managed and thus any manager could bring to the task a common body of knowledge and skills, and of course a leadership role. Education differs from other spheres because of the technology employed but this precise knowledge could be learned through experience on the job. In terms of career patterns he felt emphasis should be given to performance criteria at each level of the service (e.g. the number of staff under control, the total budget for which they were responsible) rather than qualifications. Attention should be given to the task of identifying these criteria, trying to analyse and describe the skills and abilities needed for each stage of management. A qualification could be one of the criteria stated but performance levels were paramount.

What evidence do you have about the effectiveness of the programmes offered to develop performance on the job?

If the question was asked in terms of what economic benefits had accrued to society as a whole then Mr. Bree felt there was no prima facie evidence to show investment in management education had been effective. Indeed many people would argue it was a poor investment when comparisons were made between stated aspirations and the present level of economic activity.

He referred to the negative attitudes of those who believed in the philosophy 'If it does not pay, don't do it', and suggested that they should consider where this country would be had we not had an investment of this kind. Mr. Bree went on to state that in his view we should justify programmes of education and training as a matter of faith, a general belief that they do good, and that the only real pay off would be at the level of the personal and professional development of individual students.

How do you lay down performance standards for company training programmes?

BIM (British Institute of Management) do not lay down performance

standards but do have agreed codes of conduct for managers. In extreme cases tribunals can be held. In general terms industrial performance was measured by financial success or failure, but bankruptcy for the firm or the 'sack' for individuals.

Mr. Bree stressed that promotion and rewards were key factors affecting performance, however, in recent years Government intervention had made it more difficult to look at the criteria of performance. When referring to education he felt that BIM would find it difficult to offer standards on criteria to judge the administrators except in terms of 'output' factors.

How far do the Institute's qualifications of ABIM (Associate of the British Institute of Management) and MBIM (Member of the British Institute of Management) affect individuals and their roles? Are such recognised statuses worth anything? If so, should BEAS implement a scheme of this kind?

The awards of ABIM and MBIM are not really worth much to individuals for securing and maintaining a job, nor do they help to attract new entrants to the management profession from universities and schools.

The main benefits from such awards are to the Institute as a whole. Any professional organisation wanting public recognition and standing must establish codes of conduct, discipline procedures, standards of admission, etc., and it is in this context that these awards are important.

What do you mean by cojoint action among professional bodies, particularly with reference to the relationship between BEAS and BIM?

Mr. Bree reminded members of his belief that the knowledge, techniques and skills of all concerned with the 'managing' function must be shared - one group learning from another. For this reason alone it was important for professional bodies to co-operate and

take cojoint action. However, today, there was another very important reason why such co-operation should be developed and maintained and that was the emerging threat to professionalism. With the growing trend toward greater participation and intervention the professionals would have to become more skillful in explaining and justifying their actions if they wished to survive. BIM had been preparing its members for such developments over the past two years and one of his specific roles had been to talk to other bodies and associations about the benefits of collaboration and possible affiliation to BIM. He suggested BEAS might give consideration to an arrangement of this kind.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Ron Glatter,
Professor of Educational Administration and Management,
The Open University.

Professor Glatter's paper provoked much more of a debate than a question and answer session and the two main areas of discussion and comment were:

> Possible approaches to professional development for educational administrators.
>
> The role of BEAS in stimulating and supporting this process.

Discussion began with one participant raising the issue of the discrepancy which he felt existed between the providers and consumers of courses. Course providers often concentrated too much on the academic and theoretical approaches to management and paid too little attention to practitioner needs. He, therefore, welcomed Professor Glatter's suggestions for a more applied

practitioner approach to professional development and his reference to the Swedish School Leader Education Programme as a possible model to follow. In his view the advanced courses for the able experienced person were merely the 'icing on the cake' and what should be provided were courses for staff at all levels of the system. He stressed the value of a school focussed approach, with practitioners and 'expert' academic inputs, based on an identified common core of problems within the context of the system. He felt BEAS members had a part to play in helping to define the common core of problems for courses which might then be organised through local education authorities in collaboration with other agencies along lines similar to those of the Swedish School Leader Education Programme.

This view of emphasising the needs of practitioners was supported by many other participants who also recommended an increase in the number of part-time short courses of a non-academic nature designed to be of immediate help to practising educational administrators. It was further argued that the United Kingdom should adopt a policy for professional development which had a mass impact on the system (e.g. the National Compulsory programme for Swedish Schoolleaders) rather than pursue the slow pondorous voluntary growth of the present time.

During the debate the two Swedish colleagues responsible for the School Leader Education Programme commented on the progress to date. They stressed how much they had learned during the first two years and that they were now implementing an important evaluation project as the first intake of headteachers were finishing their course. They hoped to identify what pressures and impact the programme was having on the schools and community and to analyse in detail what further opportunities for development were available. One problem area already identified was the need to establish a system of continuing support for headteachers once they had finished their course of training.

A further distinction made during this comparative debate was the

difference between the Swedish and British approaches to planning programmes. One participant praised the Swedes for their attempts to define objectives, clarify their purposes through discussion and then identify the resources necessary to implement the programme. This was in marked contrast to what she called the British disease of starting with a 'what resources have we got and how can we use them' approach.

Discussion then centred on the question of the future role of BEAS in the field of professional development.

One member made a strong plea for BEAS to take the lead in providing a new model for the academic and professional development of educational administrators, one which could well be unique to learned societies of its kind. The wide variety of academic and practitioner members provided a national network of expertise from all sectors of the educational service. BEAS should use this expertise to create a new model of training which linked theory and practice in a dynamic way. Success for the Society would then be measured in terms of how far the academics could produce courses to satisfy practitioner needs and how far the practitioners could utilise their experiences to help generate new theoretical insights. The speaker felt that a development of this kind would be far more preferable to many members than BEAS trying to emulate other learned societies with 'academic outputs' of the traditional kind.

This proposal attracted a good deal of support and in the ensuing discussions it was suggested that much could also be learned from other branches of teacher education and by studying the clinical approaches to training adopted by other professions. One member, however, expressed a concern of a different kind. In his view the problem was not one of a shortage of good ideas, it was the lack of resources to implement them, particularly training personnel with expertise in the field of educational administration. He continued by stating that apart from stimulating and supporting new approaches to professional development BEAS had an important

role to play in analysing the weaknesses of the present system and for identifying what resources were available. He also suggested that consideration should be given to the adoption of a more vigorous policy of trying to influence national committees and other agencies concerned with the control and supply of teachers and policies and programmes of in-service education and training.

Further proposals for BEAS initiatives included a detailed survey of the present provision of training for educational administrators which could be accomplished by means of a prepared questionnaire circulated through the branch organisations. Once established the directory of courses could easily be up-dated and BEAS could act as a clearing house of information for anyone interested. A similar organisational strategy was suggested for the development of BEAS case studies and other relevant materials for training purposes.

Arising from these discussions one member expressed a concern about the future of educational administration as an academic study in its own right, not just within a context of professional development. Most areas of study have learned societies which support the publication of journals to promote the growth and development of that study. Having listened to the views of some colleagues she wondered what the future role of BEAS was in this respect. She asked Professor Glatter for his opinion. In response Professor Glatter re-stated his view that he saw no conflict of interests for BEAS. Educational Administration was an applied academic study in the wider field of education, one aspect of which was professional development. To be concerned with the application of knowledge and skills to a particular field of study and the work of practitioners in that field was a legitimate academic activity and in his opinion BEAS would continue to promote that study and the interests of the members who were academics.

The future role of BEAS was also questioned when one member asked all participants to think carefully before changing the nature and direction of BEAS activities. He argued strongly that the Forum aspect of the Society should never be lost. It was this that

made the Society different from others and encouraged all types of practitioners and academics to be members. If the Society wished to become a more politically active body then it must seek the support and co-operation of other professional bodies. It could not go it alone. A more important issue perhaps was whether the Society had sufficient resources to implement and sustain political activities of this kind.

Professor Glatter agreed that the forum aspect of the Society was its strength and therefore must be maintained and developed. Personally he had doubts about the idea of entering the political arena. He said care must be taken to prevent the Society from degenerating into smaller sectional interest groups, for example, those who were the 'policy makers' versus those who were the 'managers'. It was important to try and maintain the unity of the Society which the forum helps provide. The final contribution to this debate came from a member who agreed with Professor Glatter that the Society should not emphasise divisions between groups like 'policymakers' and 'managers', however, he questioned whether membership of BEAS was fully representative of all those involved in the process of educational administration. He argued strongly for the introduction of lay members, those who were involved in policy making at all levels of the educational system, and therefore he suggested the Society should look carefully at its public image and to reconsider the title used. If lay policymakers were to be involved in the activities of the Society then it was important to use language related to their interests.

SUMMARY OF OPEN FORUM

Royston McHugh

This final session of the Conference was organised as an Open Forum designed to achieve three major objectives:

> To provide an opportunity for a panel of 'participant observers' to comment on the proceedings of the Conference.
>
> To provide an opportunity for final discussion on any aspect of the Conference theme.
>
> To provide an opportunity for Mr. T. Bone, the Open Forum Chairman, to summarise the proceedings of the Conference and to draw it to a close.

COMMENTS BY 'PARTICIPANT OBSERVERS'

Dr. Bone began the session by reminding members of the two interrelated themes of the Conference, approaches to the professional development of educational administrators and the future role of the British Educational Administration Society in that process. He asked members to keep these two interacting themes in mind during this final session.

Having introduced each member of the panel in turn he called upon them to give their 'outsider' views on the proceedings of the Conference. What follows is a summary of the main points made by each speaker.

Professor W.V. Mathur (Director, National Staff College for Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, India)

Professor Mathur told members that the problems of professional development for educational administrators in India were similar to those in the United Kingdom. However, they were of a different order of magnitude because of the size and complexity of that country.

There was great awareness for programmes of training but it would be impossible to implement a compulsory programme at this time because the size of the problem was immense. All that could be done was for Central Government to lay down guidelines. India faced major educational problems and the need for educational policies and planning was far more important.

Because of this overriding issues all that could be done at present was to implement some experimental schemes to help the practising manager. Some of the schemes he referred to were:

Encouragement to provide management opportunities on the job, for example, chairing meetings and acting as a member of working parties.

The production of a handbook - a manual for helping managers.

Alternative ways of making new appointments.

Voluntary briefing sessions for one month for new headteacher appointees.

After this brief description of the position in his own country Professor Mathur ended his talk by suggesting that one possible initiative for BEAS was the production of a manual for headteachers or for Chief Education Officers, etc. The combined wisdom of the members of the Society was most suited to this task, and the

manuals, when produced, could be given to each new appointee. He also suggested that new appointees to such positions of responsibility might attend briefing sessions for one month on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Clive Hopes (Research Fellow, Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung, Frankfurt-am-Main, Federal Republic of Germany)

Mr. Hopes began by saying it was difficult to give an account of the current state of developments in West Germany because of the limited time available. However, he would like to make one or two observations relevant to the Conference theme.

He thought the level of awareness for professional development of educational administrators was not as high as it was in the United Kingdom. There was, however, a steady growth of interest in this field and a number of effective training programmes have been implemented. He referred to the work of Dr. R. Bessoth and colleagues in Frankfurt and Dr. G. Ortner and colleagues in Paderborn as good examples of such schemes.

He reminded members that policies related to such developments were the responsibility of each Federal State and the Ministers made the decisions. These centralised schemes were implemented through Institutes and a variety of short courses (e.g. one week) were provided.

In the last part of his talk Mr. Hopes referred to one of the emerging Conference themes, the possibility of the United Kingdom moving toward a more centralised organisation for co-ordinating policies and practices for the professional development of educational administrators. He suggested to members that one of the problems facing countries having centralised systems was 'where do you get your trainers from?' The French have a centralised scheme for training the trainers but was this realistic in the context of the United Kingdom? In his view the pragmatic tradition of

this country favoured a strategy of starting from what is and moving out toward new developments. For example, the first step would be persuading all the important organisations that 'training for headteachers sometime in their career was a good thing', this could be followed by suggestions for the timing of such training. In West Germany the feeling was that new appointees should spend the first two or three years of orientating themselves to their task then benefit from a more theoretical training which would be introduced after that period. In summarising he suggested most British colleagues would favour an incremental growth pattern by example moving perhaps from a voluntary commitment to training to a situation where it would be required by the agreed terms of conditions of service.

Mr. R.W. Chapman (Nursing Officer, Department of Health and Social Security)

Mr. Chapman began by expressing a sense of relief in finding that the problems facing the education profession were similar to those facing his own colleagues in Nursing Management and in the Department of Health and Social Security. At this stage of the Conference he felt he would restrict himself to one or two comments relevant to the Conference theme:

He felt there should be central initiatives, not necessarily central decisions, for two reasons. Firstly, many managers think they know what they are doing until someone asks them, and then they find difficulty defining their skills or indeed how they have developed to their present level of responsibility. Certainly most managers cannot say why they practise as they do. This questioning is essential for clarifying roles and responsibilities, particularly at the level of middle management, and is helpful to the development of the individual. The second main benefit from such initiations was the ability of those concerned to share their wisdom and experience in order to form a coherent policy for the future.

In referring to the role of BEAS he thought the Conference itself was an expression of a state of disjuncture, the Society was questioning its future development, re-defining its role. Doubts had been expressed about the Society adopting a more political role. In his view this role had already emerged and the major question was not whether the Society should take such initiatives, but what form they should take.

Mr. Peter Samuel (General Manager, Rohrer, Hibler & Replohle, Inc., London)

Mr. Samuel took as his starting point a statement by Professor Baron about the identity of interests in BEAS. Having participated in the Conference he found no such identity of interests, instead he found a succession of interests which substantiated his opinion that there was no single process of educational administration, there was no one definition of role. Thus he felt the first task of the Society was to identify and describe the various roles in the educational administrative process. It was essential that for each role we should identify objectives, define job content and specify performance criteria for success. In addition we should describe how all these roles interlink within the system. This process is vital for any professional body and must be accomplished before any courses of training are devised.

When referring to the future role of BEAS in taking new initiatives he felt the Society had no choice. All professional associations must become proactive because there would be an increasing challenge to the present systems with an accompanying threat to professionalism. We had to do something about this if we wanted to retain a good public image and self respect. He continued by stating that there were many pressures on education and in many areas we were so out of date that the situation would not be allowed to continue much longer.

To amplify his statement he referred to the selection and recruitment of staff. He felt that most professional managers would be

highly critical of the procedures used in education. He suggested that urgent action was needed to clarify:

> Career Patterns - to work out what the various options might be and how planned industrial experience might be part of this process.
>
> Staff Development - to look at the way teachers are developed. We must take account of the trend toward participative management and the need for access to 'confidentials' by the staff involved.

Overall there must be initiatives to implement programmes of systematic appraisal and development for all staff engaged in education administration. In terms of approaches to professional development he suggested that courses should not be over emphasised, rather the trend should be toward ongoing, systematic, action learning programmes on the job with a definite stress on performance criteria and results.

Having thanked each panel member for their contribution the Chairman opened the meeting for general discussion.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The following is a summary of the main points raised in the discussion.

What alternative systems for appointments are there?

In response to this question Clive Hopes gave a brief description of a procedure used in one of the Canadian provinces. The first stage was a screening process whereby volunteers wanting selection for administrative training had to be elected by 50% of the staff. Once selected for training the candidates attended a six months planned programme organised jointly by the University and School

Board. During this period candidates could 'opt out' or be 'cooled out'. Those who were successful on this course had their names entered in a pool which entitled them to apply for any vacancies arising.

Is there any evidence to suggest such alternatives are better methods of selection?

Peter Samuel confirmed that there was evidence from the United States of America to show that more systematic approaches to selection were more effective. The approaches adopted were those which de-emphasised 'track record' and past achievements to focus on potential. The key process was to look at the skills and knowledge required for the job, to analyse what qualitative behavioural changes were required and to try and assess the potential of each candidate as a result of this process. In this context he raised the question of long term appointments for headteachers. During their term of office it was often necessary for them to change roles because of changing circumstances but what were the pressures to make them respond? Another problem facing headteachers on long term appointments was the need to find new challenges in order to maintain job satisfaction. What were the alternatives in society, where could they go? What could they do?

Peter Samuel restated his views on the need for a clear cut pattern of assessment of staff throughout their careers, particularly since the advent of industrial tribunals. Such a development could do nothing but good for the profession, regular appraisal brought benefits for all concerned. It provided a base for systematic training courses which were in harmony with the needs of the individuals and the organisations. He also stressed that management could be a lonely job and for many headteachers they could learn a great deal about themselves from what others thought of them and vice versa. This process would ensure that the whole question of human relationships was brought to the fore in the management of schools.

Mr. Chapman supported the views of Peter Samuel by reminding

members of his previous remarks about staff appraisal. It was often a traumatic process but vital for assessing needs and clarifying roles. In Nursing Management they have avoided setting up a personnel department, instead they have selected nurses who want to perform the personnel function and trained them for this purpose.

At this point one participant raised the question of whether the caring professions, including education, were unique in that personnel staff must have a good knowledge of the system because any form of appraisal must take the relationship between the professional and client (e.g. teacher and student) into account. He also wondered whether education was so far behind in the personnel function. He cited the example of the industrial and commercial visits organised by the Department of Educational Administration at the University of London to enable students to look at alternative forms of staff appraisal. Many of the students' reports stated that none of the alternatives they had seen was more effective than those in education, indeed many of the systems were not very effective in their own industrial/commercial contexts, often merely being public relations exercises.

The period of discussion ended with an account of the change in the inspection system used in one of the Australian states. Its main focus now was for promotion purposes only. The old general inspections for evaluating the work of the staff had a demoralising effect on schools and were now superceeded by evaluations focussing on the organisation as a whole.

CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY AND CLOSURE OF CONFERENCE

The Chairman had been asked before the Conference to be a participant observer with the specific brief of trying to note the main findings of the Conference as it developed and to make a summary of these points when drawing the Conference to a close. What follows is a summary of the statement he made.

Dr. Bone felt it had been a good Conference. It had its low point during Friday as colleagues realised the enormity of the task, but he felt that the first plenary session had united members in terms of general aspirations even though there was still disarray when it came to the questions of specific aims and initiatives. (Peter Samuel's reference to a succession of interests.) He referred to Professor Glatter's paper on Saturday as the high point of the Conference and thought his session was a good example of the benefits of academic analysis to a practical problem. At the end of the Conference he felt that members were somewhat nearer consensus on the way ahead, and he would attempt a summary of what he thought were the main findings that had emerged.

There was a full acceptance of Professor Baron's proposal that there should be a more systematic provision of programmes of rigorous study and planned experiences for all educational administrators, particularly for those in positions of major responsibility.

Many of the other proposals made by Professor Baron were also acceptable, for example, those relating to a major increase in resources for providers and the need for recognised qualifications.

We must accept Professor Glatter's criticism of the patchwork of courses available and the difficulties this caused the consumers. Certainly BEAS should take the lead in providing a Directory of Courses available and guidelines for users.

There was widespread support for George Baron's suggestion that we should try to persuade the Government of the need to train senior management staff and that BEAS should play a major role in the implementation of such plans. BEAS would play a part anyway because many conference participants

were already among the major providers, both as individuals and as members of their organisations. In his view BEAS would become far more proactive in implementing policies for professional development.

If we are to be in a position to play an effective part then BEAS must be more united in its views of what should be done in terms of objectives, content and courses, etc. We must describe roles, analyse job content, prepare guidelines and this planning process must involve practitioners as well as academics.

In conclusion he thought most members felt that BEAS should be more than a Forum, it should be more politically proactive regardless of the stresses and strains that they may bring. We must face up to this issue, BEAS should not duck out.

Our aim should be to develop the study and practice of educational administration for ourselves and for the community. This was an aim worthy of pursuit and to achieve it we would need to collaborate and co-operate with each other, to pool our efforts in the same direction. He thanked members for their contributions and wished them well in the future tasks ahead.

The Conference was formally closed by Professor Meredydd Hughes. In his very brief address he thanked colleagues for their attendance and said that he looked forward to the challenge ahead. There was no doubt that changes would come but in his view such changes would be evolutionary and gradual and would result from the Society taking on a more proactive role in issues like the professional development of educational administrators.

A REVIEW OF CONFERENCE DATA SHEETS AND GROUP REPORTS

Royston McHugh

During the Conference opportunities were provided for ALL participants to actively contribute to the debate on 'Professional Development in Educational Administration' and to consider specific issues arising from the three main addresses and the ensuing plenary sessions.

These objectives were achieved by:

Asking all participants to complete two data sheets.

The formation of twelve discussion groups.

Each group met for two sessions of one and a half hours and there was an interviewing period of one and a quarter hours for discussion in full session when all groups met together. (Appendix 2) Notes for participants and Group Chairmen were produced in order to help promote more effective discussions and to facilitate the preparation of groups reports. (Appendix 3)

This brief review is a summary of the views of Conference members as expressed in the group reports and in the completed data sheets. During the analysis an attempt was made to see if differences existed between the discussion groups, between providers and consumers and between members from different sectors of the educational system including: schools, further education, local education authorities, colleges of higher education, polytechnics and universities.

EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT PROVISION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

The first discussion was designed to evaluate the present provision

for professional development in Educational Administration in terms of its strengths, weaknesses and major problems.

The difficulty of this task was soon highlighted in the discussion groups when it was acknowledged that no comprehensive description of the present provision existed and even at local levels there was a lack of detailed knowledge and information about the policies and practices of the groups involved.

Few strengths were identified. Most groups and individuals felt that the diversity and variety of present provision was in itself a strength, because the flexibility and freedom of this system allowed providers to be responsive to local needs and often reflected local initiatives of a grass roots kind. The majority of groups felt that there was a growing interest and favourable climate of opinion in support of professional development in educational administration. This was expressed by better support from some LEAs and the increasing number of good applications for certain courses which was indicative of a high professional demand.

The final strength identified by one or two groups and a number of individuals was the voluntary participation of those involved. They suggested that this self selecting system allowed the keen, able and committed professional to take good advantages of what was available, thereby improving his chances for a better career. One group, however, put the opposite point of view. They felt the present self selecting voluntary system was bad for the profession and the education system as a whole.

Reported weaknesses and problems were far more abundant in group reports and in the comments made by individuals on the data sheets.

All groups identified the lack of coherent policies on the purposes, provision, control and funding of professional development as a major weakness of the present system. Many reported a lack of interest and awareness among providers at all levels of the system

and an alarming disinterest and resistance among potential consumers, many of whom thought training and development were superfluous to their needs.

Having identified diversity as a strength all groups saw it as a weakness! The present pattern of provision was one of an 'unco-ordinated', 'fragmented', 'patchy', 'ad hoc' arrangement of 'unequal distribution' throughout the country. A few bright spots were reported but overall it was unanimously agreed that this diversity of provision was unacceptable.

Nine groups reported on the problem of the lack of defined roles and responsibilities for the agencies involved and what appeared to be poor communication and co-ordination between them. Two groups and many individual providers from the data sheets focussed on the difficulties of trying to cater for all the different needs of clients and the conflicts of interest which arise. Most consumers expressed dissatisfaction on how data sheets about the unavailability of various types of courses, particularly those focussing on specialised needs and higher degree programmes in educational administration. These weaknesses were also substantiated in many group reports.

There was general agreement about the insufficient knowledge base upon which to design courses and this should be remedied as soon as possible. Many respondents called for work to be done in specifying better training objectives based on detailed analyses of role descriptions, job content, and successful performance criteria.

A great deal of criticism was forthcoming about the content of courses provided, the lack of relevant approaches like 'on the job training', 'specialist workshops', etc., and poor communication and consultation between consumers and providers.

Most groups and many individuals focussed on the lack of agreement on content, calling for a series of guidelines to be published to define a common core and minimum standards of training.

Evidence suggested that most consumers think too many courses are irrelevant to their needs, some being too academic, others mundane and most simply being a reflection of the interests and teaching strengths of the providing institution.

Another concern expressed was the difficulty of what type of course to provide. Should it be of a generalist nature catering for client groups from all sectors of the system or should the emphasis be on training for specific needs of homogenous specialist groups? There was no real agreement on this point.

The major agreement among most participants was the need for separate programmes of professional development for educationalists. Although it was recognised that overlap existed with other professional managers they felt that there was sufficient justification for a separate approach.

Responses on consumer data sheets indicated a serious lack of short, part-time courses, conferences and planned experiences which were school-based problem solving exercises of the practical kind.

All participants were concerned about the present level of resources available for programmes of professional development. A number of groups and many consumer individuals were critical of the inadequacies of many providing institutions, particularly the shortage of experienced trained personnel who understood the needs of consumers at different levels of the system. There was general concern too about the level of support given by local education authorities. Few if any LEAs had coherent policies which provided for a continuing programme of development for educational administrators.

Participants found it difficult to identify career patterns and another weakness observed was the lack of acceptance and recognition of the qualifications that were available. Some consumers felt there was a danger of too much emphasis being placed on

qualifications and called for a detailed examination of performance tasks as alternative measures of success. They felt accreditation should be subservient to the ability to do the job effectively. They maintained that too few courses were evaluated to see if they were effective or not in preparing participants for their new posts of responsibility.

One universal weakness in the present provision was the low levels of communication between all concerned. There was a dearth of information about the present provision and few instances of practitioners being involved in the planning and implementation of programmes.

In summary, the detailed analysis of data sheets indicated few major differences of opinion between the various types of conference participants. All were concerned about policies, organisation, content and resources for professional development as well as poor communication and co-ordination between the agencies involved. Similarly no major differences of views were identified in the group reports though this could well be the result of the structured nature of discussions and the wide range of interests and experience of the members in each group.

Differences of opinion which did exist were more a matter of degree than of kind. As expected the greatest differences existed between providers and consumers, the former being more concerned with questions of policy, roles and responsibilities, resources and the awareness of need for training. Colleagues from the Colleges of Higher Education and Further Education gave greater emphasis to qualifications whilst colleagues from Universities and Polytechnics were more concerned with the lack of resources, the need for rationalisation and the inadequate data base upon which to plan courses. Local authority members placed emphasis on the need for a more coherent policy for professional development and co-ordination at the local level. They also stressed the importance of providing consumer oriented courses of a practical kind.

The consumer groups concentrated on what provision was available, the lack of co-ordination and planning, content and method of courses, and support from the employing LEA. Not surprisingly they also stressed the need for a continuing programme of development in career terms.

No separate analysis of identified major problems was appropriate for this review because inevitably the concerns of participants were expressed in the weaknesses of the present system as described above. The two most repeated areas of concern were:

(a) The fragmented nature of the present provision for professional development.

(b) The content and type of courses available which were often ill-suited to practitioner needs.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES AND FUTURE PATTERNS OF PROVISION FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

As to be expected many of the changes recommended to improve the present system were directly related to the weaknesses identified in the group reports and on the data sheets from individuals.

There was general agreement on the need for some form of national integrating, co-ordinating machinery perhaps of a kind similar to the Advisory Committee for the Supply and Training of Teachers (ACSTT). That such a Committee should lay down national policies was accepted by most participants provided there was no prescriptive coercive element involved. The main role of such a body should be resourcing, facilitating, stimulating and curriculum development concerned with recommending minimum standards of training. Whatever structure was devised it must retain the flexibility and adaptability of the present system to cater for local needs. Two groups suggested the LEA should be immediately responsible for training. Until such time as this

co-ordinating body could be established many groups argued that greater pressures should be put on the Department of Education and Science (DES) and the local education authority (LEA) to formulate coherent policies for professional development. In addition a more intensive campaign for raising the levels of awareness for the need for training should be mounted.

As stated previously the majority of participants favoured separate programmes of professional development for educational administrators although they recognise the benefits to be gained from sharing knowledge and experience with other managers.

At least nine of the groups and many of the individual 'consumers' completing the data sheets strongly recommended the need for a continuing on-going, programme of professional development for all educational administrators and the introduction of regular periods of paid leave in line with the recommendations of the James Report. Many of the 'consumers' also suggested the need for a compulsory system of training with this requirement printed in the agreed terms and conditions of service.

A majority of groups recommended the publication of training guidelines but no agreement was evident about who should be responsible for their production. Reference was made to the Department of Education and Science, but other members argued for the local education authorities to be responsible for such developments.

A majority of the groups and many of the 'provider' participants strongly advocated the need for a nationalised integrated programme of professional development and most of these respondents suggested the local education authorities should be responsible for such co-ordination and control. Interestingly many of these respondents also argued that local education authorities should not be involved in <u>providing</u> the training. They felt the employer - employee relationship might prove difficult under certain circumstances and many of the courses would produce a

conflict of interests between the LEA and course participants.

At least three groups and many of the 'consumer' members stressed the need for providing a full range of courses and planned experiences to cater for the needs of administrators from all levels of the system. Particular reference was made by at least four groups to the need for problem based, on the job training which could be evaluated by an assessment of the performance in the job situation. This recommendation was also supported by many individuals on the data sheets.

A majority of participants recommended the need for better training objectives and two groups suggested that BEAS or some other responsible body should undertake research in order to describe the various roles in educational administration, identify the tasks and stipulate performance criteria for judging success. The other recommendations which found unanimous support was the need for a publication on training which contained recommendations for a common core syllabus and various forms of field-work. Some indication should also be given about the optimum time for such training, especially for those on new appointments.

At least five groups reported the view that training for positions of major responsibility should be given after the individuals had taken up their posts.

There were very few recommendations relating to the question of generalist and specialist courses. Only one group and a small number of 'consumers' argued that most courses should combine both elements that are a common core for all with optional elements to cater for specific needs. They focussed attention on the need for background 'contextual' knowledge for any specific role or problem and they felt this was best accomplished by involving participants from all sectors of the educational service.

Many Conference participants and at least four groups put forward recommendations about the need for greater involvement of

practitioners in the planning and running of courses. There was also strong support for the creation of planning teams and teams of consultants for training purposes and these should always consist of practitioners from the appropriate sectors of the service working with academic 'experts' from the local institutions of further and higher education.

A number of recommendations were made concerning the evaluation of programmes of professional development. There was evidence that many Conference participants want clearer definitions of possible career patterns for educational administrators and three group reports contained references to the need for greater mobility and transfer between the various sectors of the educational service. This view was supported by many comments on the individual data sheets where reference was also made to the need for promoting a programme of exchange visits and periods of work experience abroad, particularly to the countries within the European Economic Community.

A majority of participants were concerned about the need for evaluating the courses provided for educational administrators. There was clear evidence of support for improved forms of assessment which paid greater attention to performance criteria, and one group report contained the suggestion that a number of evaluation projects should be implemented as soon as possible to improve our knowledge and skills in the aspect of professional development. A number of 'consumers' certainly felt the present courses available for educational administrators should be evaluated to see how far they helped practitioners become more effective in their posts of responsibility.

There was strong support for the need to implement a nationally recognised and validated qualification for educational administrators, though this view was challenged by comments on the data sheets from 'consumer' participants. Whilst many of the 'consumers' accept the need for some form of accreditation they did not want too much emphasis on qualifications as such. The

strength of support for qualifications came more from the 'provider' participants at the Conference.

Some of the recommendations having strongest support were those related to the provision of resources. There was overwhelming support for the need to substantially increase the resources for professional development in educational administration, particularly to implement schemes of regular paid study leave and exchange visits, both at home and abroad. Many members stressed the need for statutory provision of compulsory programmes of professional development, similar to those of the Swedish School Leader Education Project, however, at least one group report and many individual data sheets contained statements of caution about adopting models of professional development from other countries without careful consideration of their suitability for the British Context.

A final recommendation in the area of resources was that relating to the need for increasing the number of trained personnel with expertise in the field of educational administration.

THE ROLE OF THE BRITISH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SOCIETY (BEA) IN THE PROVISION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

A major analysis of Group Reports and Conference Data Sheets was devoted to an examination of participants views on the future role of BEAS in the provision of professional development in educational administration.

The results of the analysis showed no discernable differences between the twelve discussion groups nor the various sub-groups of 'providers', 'consumers', 'academics', 'practitioners', schools, colleges, polytechnics, universities, local education authorities and those from other agencies.

What follows is a summary of the views expressed by Conference participants. An attempt has been made to arrange the findings in a developmental order of activities away from the present main function of the study, that of providing a Forum for debate through conferences and the publication of the Journal, toward an active political role at the national level.

Forum for Debate

There was unanimous support for the view that the main function of the Society, since its inception, was the provision of a forum for debate and discussion amongst the many individuals and groups concerned with the administration and management of education. The success of the Society in providing this facility was demonstrated in its large and varied membership, its conferences and lectures, branch activities, interest groups and the publication of the highly respected BEAS journal 'Educational Administration'. There was strong feeling that whatever activities the members wished to develop in the future this historic function of the Society should be rigorously maintained.

Increasing of Membership

During the Conference discussions and in the Group Reports and Data Sheets attention was drawn to the need for increasing membership of the Society in order to be fully representative of all those concerned in the administration and management of Education. Reference was made to lay groups like counsellors, school governors and managers, and to specific professional groups like advisors, inspectors and colleagues in the primary and special education sectors. Concern was also expressed about the small numbers of members from Local Education Authorities.

Interest Groups

Five of the Group Reports and many Data Sheets from individuals contained suggestions for the extension and support of interest

groups, particularly at a national level. They felt developments of this kind would help to cater for the more specialised needs and interests of sub-groups within the Society.

'Educational Administration'

One particular recommendation related to the question of encouraging more practitioner colleagues to contribute articles for the Journal. The suggestion was for the Journal to be divided into two sections, one specially allocated to material from practitioners or academics writing about work in a practitioner context.

Information Service

The majority of participants totally supported the idea of the Society developing a more proactive role in the systematic collections, collations and disseminations of information which might lead to publications of a different kind.

Two groups and many individual 'consumer' members supported the proposal that much of this type of activity could be done efficiently through the present organisation of the Society. They envisaged a central initiative asking all providers to participate in a collection of information which would then be returned to a national working party set up to analyse, collate and prepare the information for publication after Council of Management approval. Dissemination of information could be handled through the branch organisations or through some other channels. The main example of this kind of activity quoted was a 'Directory of Courses in Educational Administration and a Users Guide'. Others referred to were a paper on 'Practitioner Needs' and a 'Classification of Training Resources'.

Professional Development Activities within the Context of BEAS

Recommendations were made about the need for the Society to become more actively involved in the provision of professional

development, but mainly within the context of the Society itself. The main beneficiaries of this type of activity would be the members themselves, however, activities of this kind could provide encouragement for other colleagues to join the Society. Specific reference was made to the conferences and courses run by the Welsh, South East and West Midlands Branches of the Society, all of which had been self-financing and well attended.

It was felt therefore that this type of activity provided an important basis for development and should be given high priority for support at national level. Apart from courses and conferences suggestions were made for the production of training guidelines containing recommendations for course content, resources available, methods of working and evaluation procedures. The production of a BEAS Manual of Guidance for colleagues in schools was another proposal from a participant.

Two further areas of activity to be organised at National level were identified. The first was the development of a BEAS Resource Centre which would collect, maintain and actively develop materials for training purposes. Members felt the Society's network of expertise was well suited to the task of preparing case studies, simulations and reviewing commercially produced materials. The last proposal supported by a few members was for the Society to actively monitor and evaluate the present provision for professional development in educational administration particularly those aspects provided by members of the Society.

Public Relations

Many members felt that the Society could adopt a more active policy for Public Relations, not only to increase membership of the Society but also to inform and influence other organisations and individuals about the need for professional development. It was suggested that many of the working papers, guidelines and policy statements produced by the Society for its own members could usefully be used for this exercise. Council of Management

could ask the BEAS Publications Sub-Committee to assume the responsibility for this kind of activity. Specific reference was made of the need to inform the local education authorities (LEA), the Department of Education and Science (DES) and organisations like the Association of Metropolitan Authorities (AMA), Association of County Councils (ACC) and the Society of Education Officers (SEO). One member put a specific proposal that all the publicity material of the Society should be reviewed to ensure a good public image and to try and attract more members.

Political Pressure Groups

One of the recurring themes of discussion throughout the Conference was whether BEAS should adopt an active political role to improve the provision of professional development in educational administration. Such a development would not only involve the publication of policy statements on all aspects of professional development but also a proactive role for members seeking to persuade other key organisations and individuals of the need at national, regional and local levels. Activities of this kind would also involve co-operation and collaboration with other associations and organisations with similar political aims. These suggestions followed closely the points made by William Bree in his conference address, which were also supported by Peter Samuel and David Chapman, two of the participant observers.

Certain specific recommendations were made by Conference members. One suggestion was for BEAS to take the lead and call a National Conference of all those involved in the education and management of education to initiate discussions on the need for professional development and the setting up of a 'National Advisory Council' co-ordinating machinery of a similar kind.

A small number of participants stated a long term aim would be for BEAS to become a national body for validating qualifications and awards and to become heavily involved in the provision of professional development activities.

In analysing the views and opinions of members as expressed on the Group Reports and Data Sheets it was obvious that there was strong support for developing the role of BEAS in the provision of professional development. The majority of members seemed happy to support a strategy of gradual growth of activities building on the existing strengths of the Conference, Journal and the network of Branch activities. Participant support was definitely in favour of such activities being developed within the context of BEAS itself.

What was clearly evident in the Group Reports and Data Sheets was the degree of concern of many members about the Society adopting a much more active role in trying to inform, influence and persuade other key organisations and individuals in a political sense.

In summary there was strong evidence to suggest that the more active the future role envisaged, particularly outside the confines of the Society, the more problematic would be the reaction of its own membership let alone that of the relevant 'outsider' groups and individuals.

This review of the Proceedings of the Conference was based on the Reports from the twelve discussion groups and the Data Sheets completed by participants at the Conference.

The twelve Chairmen of the Discussion Groups produced excellent reports for this analysis which bore witness to the skill in which they guided the discussions in accordance with the notes to Discussion Group Chairmen. Thanks are also due to all participants who took the time and trouble to complete the Data Sheets which also helped to facilitate the production of the Report.

The Discussion Group Chairmen were:

Bernard Baron	Keith Ebbutt	Royston McHugh	Rene Saran
Roger Brown	Michael Locke	Peter Ribbins	Ernest Theodossin
Alan Crispin	David Lovatt	Pat Rossington	Pam Young

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

(* Overseas Visitors)

Miss R.M. Abbott	Principal Officer, Schools Management Section, Ealing
Mr. R. Aitken	Director of Education, Coventry
Mr. T.N. Axon	Deputy Head, Heathlands School, Hounslow
Mr. M. Baker	Head of Manpower Studies Group, University of Bath
Mr. A. Barnes	Headmaster, Ruffwood School, Liverpool
*Mr. T. Barr	Assistant Director, South Australia Education Department
Mr. B. Baron	Senior Lecturer in Personnel Management, Ealing Technical College
Professor G. Baron	Dept. of Educational Administration, University of London Institute of Education
Mr. G. Barrell	Former Head of Sir John Cass School, London
*Dr. M. Bayer	FEoLL-GmbH, Postfach, Germany
Mr. G. Benham	Senior Lecturer, London
Miss J. Bennett	Deputy Head, Essex
Miss R. Beresford	Pro Rector, Polytechnic of Central London
*Dr. R. Bessoth	Lecturer, Erziehungswissenschaftliche Hochschule, Federal Republic of Germany
Mr. W.D. Birch	Senior Lecturer, Loughborough University of Technology
Mr. R.H. Bird	Under-Secretary, Department of Education and Science
Professor R. Blackstone	Department of Educational Administration, University of London
Dr. R. Bolam	University of Bristol

Dr. T. Bone	Principal, Jordanhill College, Glasgow
Mr. I.G. Booth	Senior Lecturer, College of St. Hild and St. Bede, University of Durham
Mr. J.H. Booth	Headmaster, St. James' C of E (Aided) Junior School, Derby
Mr. H.G. Boulter	Assistant CEO, Northamptonshire
Mr. H.M. Bradley	Lecturer in Education, St. Katherine's College of Education, Liverpool
Dr. E.J. Brent	Principal, South Glamorgan Institute of Higher Education, Cardiff
Dr. R. Brown	Department of Trade and Industry
Dr. D.P.J. Browning	Chief Education Officer, Bedfordshire
Mr. M. Brunt	
*Professor R. Bryce	University of Alberta
Mr. W. Bryce	
Dr. E. Byrne	Education Officer, Equal Opportunities Commission, Manchester
Mr. C.R. Cannon	Examinations Secretary, Beauchamps School, Essex
Mr. W.P. Capstick	Head of Business and Management Dept. Institute of Higher Education, Doncaster
Mr. T.D.T. Carter	Chelmsford, Essex
Mr. E. Cave	Seconded by Northern Ireland Polytechnic
Mr. O. Chapman	Nursing Officer, Department of Health and Social Security
Mr. R.W. Chapman	Department of Health and Social Security
Miss J. Clarke	Headteacher, Campions School, Herts
Mr. D.M. Clarke	Head of Further Education Teacher Training, Chelmer Institute
*Mr. B.J. Courtney	Education Department, West Perth, Western Australia
Mr. D. Cracknell	Area Education Officer, Warwickshire
Dr. A. Crispin	Lecturer, University of London Institute of Education
Commander T.K. Cropper	RNSETT, HMS Nelson, Portsmouth
Mr. K. Dacombe	Tutor, Cambridge Institute of Higher Education

Mrs. T. Dacombe	Headteacher, Clipstone Brook School, Leighton Buzzard
Mr. J.L. Davies	Head of Department of Management, Anglian Regional Management Centre
Mr. K. Dickens	City of Birmingham Polytechnic
Mr. C.A. Dimmock	Lecturer in Educational Administration, University College, Cardiff
*Mr. E. Duke	Assistant Director for Education, Brisbane
Mr. K. Ebbutt	Principal Lecturer, Hounslow Borough College
*Dr. M. Ekholm	Department of Education, Sweden
Mr. G.T. Elliott	Acting Head, The Castle School, Bristol
*Mr. H. Engel	Deputy Director Regional Office for School, Northeim, Federal Republic of Germany
Dr. E.A. Ewan	Head of Department of Management and Administration, Moray House, Edinburgh
Mr. C. Falconer	
Mr. J. Fielden	Management Consultant, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.
Wing-Commander J.W. Firth	Command Education Officer, HQ, RAF Support Command
Sister Genevieve	St. Louise Comprehensive College, Belfast
Lt. Col. Glaister	Principal Lecturer, Royal Military College of Science, Shrivenham
Prof. R. Glatter	Faculty of Educational Studies, The Open University
Dr. A.D. Grady	Dean of Education, Middlesex Polytechnic
Mr. P. Grant	Headmaster, Feltham School, Hounslow
Mr. J. Grant-Wood	Headmaster, Firhill School, Edinburgh
Mr. J. Hansen	Senior Lecturer, Chelmer Institute of Higher Education
Mr. C.W. Harvey	Secretary, School of Education, University of Bristol
Mr. R.H. Herbert	Senior Lecturer in Education Studies, Wolverhampton Polytechnic
Mr. M.W. Hewlett	Headmaster, Heart of England School

Mr. D.M. Hilyer	
Mr. T.M. Hinds	Education Officer, Bucks CC
*Mr. C. Hopes	Research Fellow, Deutsches Institut fur Internationale Padagogische Forschung, Frankfurt
Mr. D.A. Howell	Senior Lecturer, University of London Institute of Education
Professor M. Hughes	University of Birmingham
Mr. L.C. Iggulden	Senior Lecturer, Bulmershe College of Higher Education
Mr. H.O. Jenkins	Senior Lecturer in Educational Management, Polytechnic of Wales
*Dr. R.E. Jennings	University of Buffalo
*Mr. B. Krommweh	Director and Chairman, REFA Fachausschule, Germany
Miss E.E. Lake	
Mr. K. Lambert	Headmaster, Great Barr School, Birmingham
Mr. J. Larkins	Headmaster, Portway School, Bristol
Mr. C.M. Lawthorn	Academic Registrar, Polytechnic of Wales
Dr. D.G. Lewis	Registrar, University of Wales, Cardiff
Mr. M. Locke	Research Officer, North East London Polytechnic
Mr. W.D. Lovatt	Assistant Dean, Middlesex Polytechnic
Mr. D.G. Lyne	Bedford College of Higher Education
Mr. J. Mangan	Senior Lecturer, Jordanhill College
Mrs. P. Maple	Officer, Business Education Council
*Mr. R.J. Marshall	Headteacher, Wanneroo Primary School, W. Australia
*Professor M.V. Mathur	Director, National Staff College for Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi
Mr. M. McInerney	Head of Education Department, Northern Ireland Polytechnic
Mr. R.H. Mercer	Principal Lecturer in Educational Management, Sheffield Polytechnic

Mr. M.A. Miller	Admissions Officer, City of London Polytechnic
Mr. R.J. Moore	Senior Assistant Registrar, Portsmouth Polytechnic
Mr. C. Morgan	Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Educational Studies, The Open University
Mr. G.A.R. McHugh	Senior Research Fellow, Faculty of Educational Studies, The Open University
Mr. R.G. Morris	Under-Secretary (Education) Association of M. Authorities
Mr. O.J. Mortimer	P/T Lecturer, Maidstone College of Technology
Miss J. Mundy	Senior Lecturer, Sheffield Polytechnic
Mr. M. Mundy	
*Professor W.L. Nell	Faculty of Education, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa
*Mr. S. Obel	General Inspector, Ministry of Education, Denmark
Mrs. M. Ollis	Longmans Publishing, Harlow, Essex
Mr. J.P. O'Mahoney	Senior Lecturer, Harrow College of Technology and Art
*Dr. F.R. Ortner	FEoLL-GmbH, Paderborn, Germany
Mr. J.M. Oswald	Paisley College of Technology
Mr. A. Paisey	Principal Lecturer, Bulmershe College of Higher Education
Mr. R. Parker	
Mr. D.L. Parkes	Staff Tutor, Further Education Staff College, Bristol
Miss A.K. Pattison	Headmistress, Kings Norton School, Birmingham
Mr. M. Perry	City Polytechnic
Mrs. J. Phillips	Deputy Head, Ruffwood School, Kirkby, Liverpool
Mr. A. Pollock	Education Officer, Bucks CC/HO Prisons Dept.
Miss M. Preedy	Faculty of Educational Studies, The Open University

Mr. S. Ranson	University of Birmingham
Mr. L. Reasey	Senior Lecturer, Bulmershe College of Higher Education
Mr. H.A. Rees	Principal, Portsmouth College of Art, Design and Further Education
Mr. T.D.M. Rees	Co-Ordinator of the Education Courses, University of Warwick
Mr. P. Ribbins	Lecturer, University of Birmingham
*Dr. E. Ricatti	Ministry of Education, Milan
Mr. C.R. Riches	Lecturer, The Open University, Faculty of Educational Studies
Mrs. A. Ringguth	Admissions Officer and Faculty Officer, Polytechnic of North London
Mrs. M.A. Rogers	Registrar, Modern Tutorial College, London
Mrs. P. Rossington	Deputy Head, Heathlands School, Hounslow
Mr. P. Rossington	Principal, Kilburn Polytechnic, London
Mr. A.J. Rowland	Llanidloes, Wales
Mr. P. Samuel	Rohrer, Hibler and Replogle Inc, London
Dr. R. Saran	P. Lecturer, City of London Polytechnic
Mr. T.J. Simkins	Lecturer in Educational Planning and Administration, University of Manchester
Mr. R.A. Sisson	Bretton Hall College of Higher Education
Mr. N.J. Small	Staff Tutor, Open University, Yorkshire Region
Mr. R.K. Smart	Lecturer, School of Education, University of Reading
*Mr. N.E. Stego	Principal, Skolledarutbildningen, Sweden
Mr. R.B. Sturge	Curriculum Officer, Schools Council
Mr. D. Sturgeon	Deputy Secretary, Heriot-Watt University, Scotland
Mr. B.H. Sutton	D. Principal, Bournemouth College of Technology
Mr. A.W. Tait	Assistant Secretary, The Open University
Mr. G.W. Taylor	Headmaster, The Deans School, Essex

Mr. E.F. Theodossin	Senior Lecturer, Hertfordshire College of Higher Education
Dr. P. Thomas	Headteacher, Gillespie High School, Edinburgh
Miss P.M. Thompson	Headteacher, Turves Green School, Birmingham
Mr. T.W. Thornley	Senior Lecturer, Preston Polytechnic
Mrs. B. Tipton	Lecturer, University of London Institute of Education
*Professor W.M. Toombs	Dean of Education, University of Regina, USA.
Mr. S. Wallonton	Education Officer, Harringey
Mr. G.E. Walster	Head of Department, Queen Margaret College, Edinburgh
Mr. D. Watson	Head of Department of Educational Management, Sheffield Polytechnic
*Mr. M. Welcker	Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, University of Utah, USA.
Mr. A. Westoby	Lecturer, Open University
Mr. A. Wiley	Senior Lecturer, South West London College
Rev. Canon K.R. Wilkes	Director of Education, Diocese of Bristol
Mr. R. Wilkins	Teacher, Langley Boys' School, Kent
Mr. J.R.C. Wilkinson	Academic Registrar, Middlesex Polytechnic
Mrs. A.R. Williamson	Deputy Principal, Keswick Hall College
Mr. B.F. Withers	Head of Department of General Education, City of Bath Technical College
Mr. D. Wright	Sunderland Polytechnic
Mrs. P. Young	Lecturer, University of London Institute of Education
Miss H. Williamson	Head of Social Services Department, North London Polytechnic

APPENDIX 2

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

BEAS ANNUAL CONFERENCE 1978

DATES: From 10.30 on Friday, September 15th
to 15.30 on Saturday, September 16th

LOCATION: Westfield College, London

PARTICIPANTS: Drawn from

(a) BEAS members (residential, non-residential)

(b) Invited speakers

(c) Invited non-member participants from the UK and other European countries

(d) Other International observers

A complete list of participants will be provided

CONFERENCE THEME AND TITLE: The title of the Conference is

'EDUCATIONAL AMINISTRATION: APPROACHES TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT'

Particular attention will be given to the following questions.

Q.1 Who are the educational administrators?

Q.2 What is the present position regarding research, education and training in educational administration?

Q.3 Is there a need for separate programmes for professional development in Educational Administration? Are there relevant and worthwhile comparisons with other professional groups?

Q.4 Where should we be going? Certification? A Register of Educational Administrators? Can we create a model for the future?

Q.5 What role should BEAS play in the sphere of professional development in Educational Administration?

CONFERENCE ACTIVITY: There will be three main speakers, group discussions, plenary sessions and a concluding Forum. All participants are allocated to a discussion group. A full list of groups is provided.

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15TH

10.00 - 10.30 Arrival and Registration

10.30 - 11.00 COFFEE

11.00 - 12.30 SESSION I: QUESTIONS 1 and 2

Objectives:

(i) A BEAS member to give a personal, analytic, evaluative talk in order to provoke discussion of general issues relating to the whole question of professional development of educational administrators, including the role of BEAS.

(ii) General discussion of the issues raised, under direction of a Chairman.

Speaker: Professor George Baron
University of London

'The British Educational Administration Society: The Next Seven Years'

Chairman: Peter Browning,
Chief Education Officer, Bedfordshire
Chairman of BEAS

13.00 - 14.00 LUNCH

14.00 - 15.15 SESSION 2: QUESTION 3

(i) A speaker from Public Services to provide a critical 'outsider' challenge to the concept of separate development programmes in educational administration.

(ii) General discussion of issues raised, under the direction of a Chairman.

Speaker: Mr. William Bree,
Deputy Director General,
British Institute of Management

'Separate But Equal'
Professional Development -
Can it work?

Chairman: John Davies,
Head of Department of Management
in the Public Services, Anglian
Regional Management Centre

15.15 - 16.30 SESSION 3: DISCUSSIONS IN GROUPS

Objectives:

(i) To provide opportunities for structured discussions in order to analyse and evaluate the present position of professional development in educational administration.

(ii) To compile group plenary reports to include: a series of statements relating to agreements, disagreements within the group. Identification of at least four major questions needing further discussion.

Chairman: Identified on list of participants

16.30 - 17.00 TEA

17.00 - 18.00 BEAS ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

19.00 - 20.00 DINNER

20.00 - 21.15 SESSION 4: DISCUSSION IN FULL SESSION

Objectives:

(i) Chairman with help from two 'summarisers' to provide feedback statements from group discussions on the present position of professional development.

(ii) General discussion based on identified questions followed by Chairman's summary.

Chairman: Stan Wallington
Education Officer (Administration)
London Borough of Haringey
Chairman, South East Branch, BEAS

Summarisers:

John Davies
Anglian Regional Management Centre

Royston McHugh
The Open University

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16TH

BREAKFAST

09.00 - 10.30 SESSION 5: QUESTIONS 4 and 5

Objectives:

(i) A BEAS speaker to give personal views on future developments, i.e. 'models' of professional development (and possible role of BEAS?), in the field of educational administration.

(ii) General discussion of issues raised under direction of Chairman.

Speaker: Professor Ron Glatter
The Open University

'Professional Development: Future Pathways'

Chairman: Paul Grant,
Headmaster, The Feltham School, Feltham.

10.30 - 11.00 COFFEE

11.00 - 12.30 SESSION 6: DISCUSSION IN GROUPS

Objectives:

(i) To provide opportunities for structured discussions on possible 'models' for professional development of educational administrators.

(ii) To compile group plenary reports to include a series of statements of agreements and disagreements, a possible 'model' for professional development, and the identification of four major questions needing further discussion/ clarification.

Chairman: Identified on list of participants

13.00 - 14.00 LUNCH

14.00 - 15.30 SESSION 7: OPEN FORUM

Objectives:

(i) To provide an open Forum for further views, comments and questions on the professional development of educational administrators.

(ii) General discussion and comment.

(iii) Summing up by the Chairman including Question 6, the future role of BEAS in relation to professional development in educational administration.

Speakers: A panel to be drawn from members and non-members participating, to cover

(a) Feedback statements from group discussion

(b) Industry, commerce and public services

(c) European and other International Educational Administrators

Chairman: Tom Bone, Principal, Jordanhill College of Education

15.30 **CONFERENCE CLOSURE**

Chairman: Professor Meredydd Hughes
University of Birmingham

15.40 - 16.00 TEA AND CONFERENCE DISPERSAL

APPENDIX 3

DISCUSSION GUIDES AND DATA SHEETS

NOTES FOR DISCUSSION GROUP CHAIRMEN

Thank you for accepting the role of Chairman of one of the Discussion Groups, we appreciate your co-operation and support.

Attached you will find copies of:

(a) DISCUSSION GUIDE 1 (SESSION 3)

(b) DISCUSSION GUIDE 2 (SESSION 6)

These guides have been prepared in order to achieve the following objectives:

(i) To provide opportunities for ALL participants to be actively involved in the small group discussions.

(ii) To help promote effective group discussions in order to achieve the overall objectives of the Conference.

(iii) To facilitate the preparation of group reports.

Used in conjunction with the DATA SHEETS:

(iv) To provide detailed information to help Chairman to compile a final report on group discussions after the Conference.

Please accept these Discussion Guides in the spirit and purpose for which they are meant. Adapt them as you wish but please bear in mind the stated objectives for SESSION 3 and SESSION 6.

You will also find attached a copy of Notes to Participants and Data Sheets. We hope these papers are self explanatory and that you understand how the Data Sheets are to be used in conjunction with the group discussion in SESSION 3 and SESSION 6.

If you have any queries will you please contact Roy McHugh.

DISCUSSION GUIDE 1 SESSION 3 Friday, 3.15 p.m.

Context: Within a broader context of the talks given by Professor G. Baron and Mr. W. Bree you are asked to achieve the following objectives in Session 3.

Objective 1: To promote discussion within your group in order to analyse and evaluate the PRESENT PROVISION for 'professional development in educational administration'.

Procedure: The following procedure is recommended.

a) Appoint a rapporteur.

15 minutes b) Survey the group to elicit individual evaluations (DATA SHEET 1) in order to collate information on the strengths, weaknesses and major problems of the PRESENT PROVISION for 'professional development'.

45 minutes c) Discussion of some of the major issues, problems, questions identified from the group survey.

15 minutes d) Summary of discussions in order to formulate a group report.

e) Chairman to collect DATA SHEET 1 from participants.

Objective 2: The group to prepare a brief written report to include:

1) General conclusions

2) Agreements/disagreements in the group

3) Three major questions needing further discussion.

DISCUSSION GUIDE 2 SESSION 6 Saturday, 11.00 a.m.

Context: Within the context of all previous sessions of the Conference, particularly the talk by Professor R. Glatter in SESSION 5, you are asked to achieve the following objectives in SESSION 6.

Objective 1: To promote group discussion in order to identify possible FUTURE PATTERNS OF PROVISION for 'professional development in educational administration'.

Procedure: The following procedure is recommended.

a) Appoint a rapporteur.

10 minutes b) Ask ALL members of the group to complete DATA SHEET 2 in order to summarise their ideas prior to a discussion of some of the major issues involved.

60 minutes c) Survey the group in order to collect information as the basis for further discussion on

i) recommended changes for FUTURE PROVISION
ii) the role of BEAS in the provision of 'professional development'

20 minutes d) Summary of discussions in order to formulate a group report.

e) Chairman to collect DATA SHEET 2 from participants.

Objective 2: The group to produce a brief written report to include:

1) General conclusions

2) Agreements/disagreements in the group.

3) Three questions relating to the role of BEAS in the field of 'professional development'.

NOTES FOR PARTICIPANTS

Attached you will find two DATA SHEETS which you are asked to complete at different stages of the Conference for use in the small group discussions.

The main objectives for using the DATA SHEETS are:

a) To provide opportunities for ALL participants to actively contribute to the debate on 'Professional Development in Educational Administration'.

b) To help promote effective discussion in the small groups and plenary sessions.

c) To facilitate the preparation of group reports.

d) To generate detailed information for use in the compilation of the Conference Proceedings, to be published later in the year.

Please co-operate and complete the DATA SHEETS as follows:

DATA SHEET 1	To be completed any time BEFORE the beginning of SESSION 3 (Friday, 3.15 p.m.)
DATA SHEET 2	To be completed at the START of SESSION 6, when notified by the Group Chairman (Saturday, 11.00 a.m.)

Group Chairman will collect in all Data Sheets at the end of each session.

Members of the Organising Committee would like to reassure all participants that the collection of data is for the purposes described above and that anonymity will be preserved throughout all reports. Therefore, PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE DATA SHEETS (unless you feel compelled to do so!!)

DATA SHEET 1 SESSION 3 Friday, 3.15 p.m.

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND TAKE IT WITH YOU FOR USE IN SESSION 3.

1.

Present Post/Position	Type of Institution	Region of Country
(e.g. Teacher, Lecturer, Head of Department)	(e.g. LEA, School, Polytechnic)	(e.g. Name of City, County, Borough)
_____	_____	_____

2. What is your specific interest in the field of 'Professional Development'? (e.g. As a 'consumer'/'provider')

3. Summarise briefly your personal evaluation of the PRESENT PROVISION for 'Professional Development in Educational Administration' with reference to:

   (a) Strengths

   (b) Weaknesses

   (c) Major Problems

4. Write down three important questions, relating to the PRESENT PROVISION for 'Professional Development in Educational Administration', which you would like discussed.

   Q.1

   Q.2

   Q.3

PLEASE GIVE THIS DATA SHEET TO YOUR CHAIRMAN AT THE END OF SESSION 3.

DATA SHEET 2 SESSION 6 Saturday, 11.00 a.m.

PLEASE TAKE THIS FORM WITH YOU TO SESSION 5 AND COMPLETE AS INSTRUCTED.

1.	Present Post/Position	Type of Institution	Region of Country
	(e.g. Assistant Ed. Officer/Headteacher)	(e.g. College of FE, University)	(e.g. Name of Town, County)
	_____	_____	_____

2. What is your specific interest in the field of 'Professional Development'? (e.g. As a 'consumer'/'provider)

3. List three major changes you would like to see implemented to improve the provision for 'Professional Development in Educational Administration'.

   C.1

   C.2

   C.3

4. State three important initiatives you would like BEAS to take in the field of 'Professional Development in Educational Administration'.

   I.1

   I.2

   I.3

PLEASE GIVE THIS DATA SHEET TO THE CHAIRMAN AT THE END OF SESSION 5.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the Society is open to individuals in the United Kingdom who are interested in promoting a fruitful relationship between practice, teaching and research in educational administration. The current membership subscription which includes membership of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and a copy of each of the Society's publications is £6. per annum. All enquiries should be addressed to: R.P. Hornung, Secretary, Middlesex Polytechnic, The Burroughs, London NW4 4BT.

PUBLICATIONS SUBSCRIPTIONS

The Council of Management has instituted a Publications Subscription Rate of £7. per annum, which covers, at present, two issues of the Journal and the Proceedings of the Annual Conference. It is available to institutions, both in Britain and overseas, and to individuals overseas*, but carries no rights of membership to the Society. All enquiries should be addressed to the Business Manager of Educational Administration, Mr. D.L. Parkes, Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol. BS18 6RG.

*Overseas Subscription for Volume 8 will be £8.50.

NOTE TO PROSPECTIVE CONTRIBUTORS

Articles and shorter notes for possible publication, as well as suggestions from members for future articles or other features are always welcomed by the Editorial Board. Text for consideration should be sent (two copies, typewritten and double spaced) to the Editor or Associate Editor, who will be glad to be consulted when the proposed contribution is still at the planning stage.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Professor M. G. Hughes (Editor)
D. L. Parkes (Associate Editor and Business Manager)
Dennis Baylis, London University Institute of Education
(Information Officer)
J. L. Davies, North East London Polytechnic
Dr. E. A. Ewan (BEAS Honorary Secretary)
R. Glatter, Professor, Open University
R. P. Hornung (BEAS Honorary Treasurer)
G. A. R. McHugh, Faculty of Educational Studies,
The Open University.

BRITISH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SOCIETY

COUNCIL 1978/79

Honorary President
Professor G. Baron

Honorary Vice-President
Professor E.W.H. Briault — University of Sussex

Council 1978/79

Chairman
Professor M.G. Hughes — Head of Department of Social & Administrative Studies in Education, University of Birmingham.

Vice-Chairman
A.R. Barnes — Headmaster, Ruffwood School, Kirby, Liverpool.

Honorary Secretary
Dr. E.A. Ewan — Head of Department of Educational Management and Administration, Moray House College of Education, Edinburgh.

Honorary Treasurer
R.P. Hornung — Secretary, Middlesex Polytechnic.

Dr. T. Bone — Principal, Jordanhill College of Education, Glasgow.

D.P.J. Browning — Chief Education Officer, County Hall, Bedford.

J.L. Davies — Head of Department of Management in the Public Service, Anglian Regional Management Centre, North East London Polytechnic.

Professor R. Glatter — Professor of Educational Administration, The Open University.

M. Hewlett — Headmaster, Heart of England School, Coventry.

H.O. Jenkins — Department of Management Studies, The Polytechnic of Wales, Pontypridd.

J.F. Mann — Secretary, Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations.

G.A.R. McHugh — Senior Research Officer, The Open University

D.L. Parkes — Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol.

L.E. Watson — Head, Department of Education Management and In-Service Education, Sheffield City Polytechnic.

ISSN 0307 9090

113